

COLLÈGE DE FRANCE – CNRS
CENTRE DE RECHERCHE D'HISTOIRE
ET CIVILISATION DE BYZANCE

TRAVAUX ET MÉMOIRES
21/2

AUTOUR
DU *PREMIER HUMANISME BYZANTIN*
& DES *CINQ ÉTUDES SUR LE XI^e SIÈCLE*,
QUARANTE ANS APRÈS PAUL LEMERLE

édité par
Bernard FLUSIN
&
Jean-Claude CHEYNET

*Ouvrage publié avec le concours
de l'université Paris-Sorbonne*

Association des Amis du Centre d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance
52, rue du Cardinal-Lemoine – 75005 Paris
2017

ORIENT ET MÉDITERRANÉE (UMR 8167) / MONDE BYZANTIN
COLLÈGE DE FRANCE / INSTITUT D'ÉTUDES BYZANTINES

TRAVAUX ET MÉMOIRES

– publication annuelle paraissant en un ou deux fascicules –

Fondés par Paul LEMERLE

Continués par Gilbert DAGRON

Dirigés par Constantin ZUCKERMAN

Comité de rédaction :

Jean-Claude CHEYNET, Vincent DÉROCHE,
Denis FEISSEL, Bernard FLUSIN

Comité scientifique :

Wolfram BRANDES (Francfort)	Peter SCHREINER (Cologne – Munich)
Jean-Luc FOURNET (Paris)	Werner SEIBT (Vienne)
Marlia MANGO (Oxford)	Jean-Pierre SODINI (Paris)
Brigitte MONDRAIN (Paris)	

Secrétariat de rédaction, relecture et composition :
Emmanuelle CAPET

©Association des Amis du Centre d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance – 2017
ISBN 978-2-916716-64-0
ISSN 0577-1471

EMPEROR LEO VI THE WISE AND THE “FIRST BYZANTINE HUMANISM”: ON THE QUEST FOR RENOVATION AND CULTURAL SYNTHESIS¹

by Theodora ANTONOPOULOU

I. LEO VI IN P. LEMERLE’S *LE PREMIER HUMANISME BYZANTIN* AND SUBSEQUENT SCHOLARSHIP

Le premier humanisme byzantin was not just the title of a very successful book. The term itself, inextricably woven with the name of Paul Lemerle, has become classic and for more than forty years has shaped our view of the revival of letters in Byzantium in the ninth and tenth centuries. However, as a result of a bizarre twist of the great scholarship invested in this book, Emperor Leo VI the Wise is *quasi-absentee* from it. Merely a single page is dedicated to him at the beginning of the chapter on Arethas, whose activity largely evolved in Leo’s reign.² In sharp contrast to his father, Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus is the subject of a whole chapter as the key figure of the “encyclopaedism” of the tenth century. The most favourable description Leo receives is that of “un homme de culture,” whereas his son is characterized as “l’érudit couronné.” The picture Lemerle drew emerges nowadays as unfair, at Leo’s expense, and is in desperate need of amending. Moving in this direction, the present study will focus on Leo’s significance for the so-called “First Byzantine humanism” and the cultural history of his time. To this end, the culture the emperor displays in his writings, his personality as it emerges from his literary work, and his contribution to the revival of learning and the cultural activity in his reign will be examined. The influence Leo’s works exercised on posterity and on later authors will also be dealt with.

1. Research for this article benefited from an one-month stay in Paris in the academic year 2015–2016 as invited professor at the université Paris IV-Sorbonne in the framework of the “Labex RESMED” (“Laboratoire d’excellence: Religions et sociétés dans le monde méditerranéen”; <http://www.labex-resmed.fr>). I am grateful to the board of the Labex for this opportunity. Thanks are also due to the editors of the present volume for their invitation to participate in it.

2. LEMERLE, *Premier humanisme*, pp. 206–7. Occasionally, reference is made there to old scholarly confusions of Leo VI with Leo the Philosopher, on the one hand, and Constantine the Sicilian, on the other; see the General Index to the book under these names.

Autour du Premier humanisme byzantin & des Cinq études sur le xi^e siècle, quarante ans après Paul Lemerle, éd. par B. Flusin & J.-C. Cheynet (Travaux et mémoires 21/2), Paris 2017, p. 187–233.

I will start by stressing that Lemerle's argument was based on a number of factors, which he was careful to explain. First of all, the silence of the sources regarding Leo's culture. The sixth book of Theophanes continuatus, which dedicates its first section to Leo, "est d'un contenu si pauvre et si médiocre qu'on ne saurait tirer aucune conclusion du fait qu'il ne souffle mot de la culture de Léon VI ou de ses préoccupations dans ce domaine." Although the *Vita Basili* claims that Photios was tutor to Basil I's children, Lemerle rightly underlined the uncertainties surrounding the circumstances, content and duration of this teaching.³ He noted, of course, Leo's sobriquet "the Wise" and his calligraphic activity, and summarily listed his writing and oratorial activity: his legal and military works, about which Lemerle simply claimed that only a small part of them was his, as well as his discourses, homilies and religious poems. Unfortunately, Lemerle relied on Albert Vogt's misguided remark that Leo "semble ignorer la littérature antique." Even though Lemerle recognized that the article Vogt had dedicated to Leo's youth reproduced many old mistakes, it seems that he accepted this view, even wondering whether this was a personal preference of Leo's or the result of the education he had received from Photios.⁴ In addition, Lemerle noted that Leo did not legislate on education. Nevertheless, he concluded on a positive note, underlining the appreciation which culture enjoyed in Byzantium in general, and in court in particular, enabling an educated man such as Leo and a crowned scholar like Constantine VII to appear in the succession of the illiterate Basil I. This is an obviously climactic appreciation of the first three Macedonian emperors, and, one might say, of their involvement in the progress of humanism in their reigns.

In addition to these remarks, Leo is mentioned in passing on two occasions in connection with the encyclopaedic movement. The first case concerns encyclopaedism in military art, which is said to have begun under Leo and continued after Constantine VII in the environment of Nicephorus Phocas and Nicephorus Ouranos. A military encyclopaedia conceived by Constantine and surviving in cod. *Laurentianus* 55, 4 (mid-10th cent.) contains a corpus of military treatises from antiquity and Byzantium plus Leo's works.⁵ The second case is that of the legal encyclopaedia compiled under Basil and Leo, the *Basilica*.⁶ These mentions, however, are curiously not brought into correlation with each other nor with the rest of Leo's activity. It appears that Lemerle was uncomfortable with Leo and rather unwilling to unite the disparate elements at his disposal, focussed as he was on Constantine VII. It is easily observed that the limitations of Lemerle's exposition are not only those of the available sources, but also of the scholarship of his day. Leo had been disregarded for a very long time. Contrary to the cases of Photios and Arethas, no extensive study had ever been devoted to the wise emperor apart from a Russian monograph published in 1892,⁷ which had hardly any influence.

3. LEMERLE, *Premier humanisme*, p. 206 n. 5. For Book VI of Theophanes continuatus, one still consults the Bonn edition, while awaiting the new one in the CFHB. For the *Vita Basili* see below, n. 18.

4. A. VOGT, La jeunesse de Léon VI le Sage, *Revue historique* 174, 1934, pp. 389–428, esp. 403–11, quoted and commented upon by LEMERLE, *Premier humanisme*, pp. 206 n. 4 and 207.

5. LEMERLE, *Premier humanisme*, pp. 292–3.

6. LEMERLE, *Premier humanisme*, p. 295.

7. Н. А. Попов [N. A. ПОРОВ], *Император Лев VI Мудрый и его царствование в церковно-историческом отношении*, Москва 1892; repr. 2008.

An important, although overlooked, reaction to such a diagram of Byzantine culture came a few years later. In a short paper, rarely quoted, Évelyn Patlagean responded to Lemerle’s book by introducing Leo VI’s figure alongside Constantine VII. She spoke of the tenth century as that of the two emperors (“le siècle de Léon VI et de Constantin VII”) and noted that it represented “le point culminant de l’union entre pouvoir, savoir et discours dans la figure impériale” in the entire Byzantine history.⁸ This ambiguous scholarly situation lasted until the pioneering work of Andreas Schminck on the emperor’s crucial contribution to the legislative activity which had been initiated by his father and which produced a huge legal corpus at the end of the ninth and the beginning of the tenth centuries.⁹ Pointing in the direction of a new approach to Leo, Athanasios Markopoulos observed that if one day we reconstruct the emperor’s readings and personal library, just as this was possible with Arethas, the “First Byzantine humanism” would have to be chronologically redefined.¹⁰ He also spoke of Leo’s ambivalence between, on the one hand, “traditional” literary activity, with reference to superficial verbal and rhetorical borrowings from antiquity, and, on the other hand, the emerging encyclopaedism of his era, as he exploited previous authors for his own literary endeavours, as evident in the *Tactica*.¹¹

Afterwards, interest in Leo peaked. In 1997, two dissertations on Leo were published almost simultaneously, one by the present author, investigating the emperor’s homiletic oeuvre, the other, which dealt with his person and reign, concentrating specifically on the political and military history of the time, by Shaun Tougher.¹² Subsequently, an appreciation of Leo’s literary oeuvre was attempted by Alexander Kazhdan, who in the second volume of his history of Byzantine literature dedicated some pertinent and perspicacious pages to Leo, in an effort to do him justice as an author.¹³ In addition, a number of editions of Leo’s works, which have provided trustworthy texts as the necessary

8. É. PATLAGEAN, La civilisation en la personne du souverain : Byzance, x^e siècle, *Le temps de la réflexion* 4, 1983, pp. 181–94, esp. 194.

9. See A. SCHMINCK, *Studien zu mittelbyzantinischen Rechtsbüchern* (Forschungen zur byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte 13), Frankfurt am Main 1986.

10. Α. ΜΑΡΚΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ [A. MARKOPOULOS], Ἐπίγραμμα πρὸς τιμὴν τοῦ Λέοντος ΣΤ’ τοῦ Σοφοῦ, Σύμμεικτα 9, 1994 (= *Mnήμη Δ. Α. Ζακυθηνοῦ*), pp. 33–40, esp. 40; repr. in Id., *History and literature of Byzantium in the 9th-10th centuries* (Variorum CS 780), Aldershot, Hampshire – Burlington VT 2004, no. XVIII.

11. Α. ΜΑΡΚΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ [A. MARKOPOULOS], Ἀποσημειώσεις στόν Λέοντα ΣΤ’ τὸν Σοφό, in *Θυμίαμα : στή μνήμη τῆς Λασκαρίνας Μπούρα*, Αθῆνα 1994, pp. 193–201, esp. 193–4; repr. in Id., *History and literature* (quoted n. 10), no. XVI.

12. T. ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of the emperor Leo VI* (The medieval Mediterranean 14), Leiden – New York – Köln 1997; S. TOUGHER, *The reign of Leo VI (886–912)* (The medieval Mediterranean 15), Leiden – New York – Köln 1997.

13. A. KAZHDAN, *A history of Byzantine literature (850–1000)*, ed. by C. Angelidi (National Hellenic Research Foundation, Institute for Byzantine research. Research series 4), Athens 2006, pp. 53–65. However, other critics seem still to be playing down the qualities of (some of) Leo’s works; see J. O. ROSENQVIST, *Bysantinsk litteratur från 500-talet till Konstantinopels fall 1453*, Stockholm 2003; transl. J. O. Rosenqvist & D. R. Reinsch, *Die byzantinische Literatur : vom 6. Jahrhundert bis zum Fall Konstantinopels 1453*, Berlin – New York 2007, pp. 90–1; also, S. EFTHYMIADIS, Greek Byzantine hagiography in verse, in *The Ashgate research companion to Byzantine hagiography. 2, Genres and contexts*, ed. by S. Efthymiadis, Farnham – Burlington VT 2014, pp. 161–79, esp. 166–7 (on the verse *Hom. 26* on St. Clement of Ancyra).

prerequisite for any further discussions, were published in the last decades. Notably, his *Novels* appeared in a revised edition and exemplary translation (into modern Greek) by Spyros Troianos. The critical edition of the corpus of his forty-two homilies was due to the present author, while Leo's *Tactica* became the subject both of a critical edition by George Dennis and an extensive commentary by John Haldon.¹⁴ Furthermore, in a number of scholarly articles, their authors published and dealt with texts either by or regarding the emperor. Commendably, a recent book focusing on Leo's four marriages and destined for the wider public, incorporates references to his literary work into the account of his marital adventures. Moreover, it rightly insists on the theme of *taxis* (order) and the departures from it in Leo's ideology and life.¹⁵

It is not my purpose to provide a list of the ever-growing number of publications relevant to Leo, several of which will be cited later in this article. Altogether, however, it is clear that considerable literature concerning Leo's person and work has appeared since Lemerle's book, the main exception being his hymnographic work, of which no comprehensive study exists. In light of the above, a reevaluation of the wise emperor's literary personality and contribution to the intellectual and literary movement of his time appears not only necessary but also possible. What follows is such an attempt, focusing on certain aspects of the emperor's genuine works.¹⁶

II. LEO VI'S CULTURE: CLASSICAL AND CHRISTIAN

During the half century of Basil I and Leo's reigns there is no evident trace of organised higher state education, while the school of the Magnaura seems to have been abandoned after the death of Leo the Philosopher (after 869). It was for this reason that Constantine VII reorganised higher education, and was given credit for it in historiography.¹⁷ Basil, however, took care that his sons were tutored by the finest intellect of the time, Photios.¹⁸ Moreover, young Leo's enthusiasm for reading was without doubt a serious reason, apart from the author's personal motives, for the historian and grammarian

14. Leo VI, *Nov.*; *Leonis VI Sapientis imperatoris Byzantini Homiliae*, quas ed. T. Antonopoulou (CCSG 63), Turnhout 2008; Leo VI, *Taktika*, with J. F. HALDON, *A critical commentary on the Taktika of Leo VI* (DOS 44), Washington DC 2014. The *Book of eparch* bears Leo's name, but it was not actually written by him; see below, pp. 225–6 with n. 181.

15. See P. CESARETTI, *Le quattro mogli dell'imperatore: storia di Leone VI di Bisanzio e della sua corte*, Milano 2015 (with no footnotes; basic bibliography on pp. 156–9). On *taxis* in Leo's works, see the references below, n. 120.

16. On Leo's works, see ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 10, 19–23, as well as EAD., lemma "Leon VI", in *Neues Tusculum-Lexikon byzantinischer Autoren*, hrsg. von M. Grünbart & A. Riehle (forthcoming). In both contributions bibliography is also provided on the spurious works attributed to Leo; cf. below, p. 229 with nn. 205–8.

17. A. MARKOPOULOS, In search for "higher education" in Byzantium, *ZRVI* 50, 1, 2013 (= *Mélanges Ljubomir Maksimović*), pp. 29–44, esp. 36–8 with n. 75, partly *contra* LEMERLE, *Premier humanisme*, pp. 263–6. On certain aspects of Byzantine education, cf. also A. MARKOPOULOS, Teachers and textbooks in Byzantium, ninth to eleventh centuries, in *Networks of learning: perspectives on scholars in Byzantine East and Latin West, c. 1000–1200*, ed. by S. Steckel, N. Gaul, M. Grünbart (Byzantinische Studien und Texte 6), Zürich – Berlin 2014, pp. 3–16.

18. On Photios as Leo's teacher, see *Vita Basiliī* (Theophanes continuatus V) chap. 44, ll. 13–4, p. 160: "It was then that he offered him the hospitality of the imperial palace and appointed him as

Theognostos to dedicate his *Orthography* to him, a work that had been composed around the middle of the century, that is, roughly a quarter of a century earlier.¹⁹ Leo neither inspired nor acted as a patron for the composition of this work, yet the dedication is indicative of an intellectual climate in the 870s which was favourable to education, at least at the highest level of society. Moreover, it is noteworthy that according to a text hostile to Leo, a fragment of what appears to be a *Life of Nicetas David the Paphlagonian*, the emperor offered Nicetas David, a pupil of Arethas, firstly a position teaching philosophy, then one teaching rhetoric, both of which Nicetas rejected.²⁰ This is a meagre indication of the availability of these subjects in the capital at the beginning of the tenth century and perhaps of Leo’s care for their teaching.

There has been general consensus among scholars old and new that the main reason for Leo’s acquiring the epithet “the wise” was his learning, erudition and literary activity. Notably, in his 1997 monograph on Leo VI, S. Tougher dedicated a chapter to the analysis of the emperor’s wisdom, offering some novel conclusions.²¹ He suggested a multiple-level interpretation, according to which Leo’s erudition and literary oeuvre were but one aspect of his wisdom. In fact, it was reaffirmed that Leo was already known as wise during his lifetime and it was reasonably suggested that Basil I was at the origin of his sobriquet. On the testimony of the second of the mirror of princes, which, according to its title, was addressed to Leo by Basil I, it emerges that in accordance with his father’s ideological targets, Leo was urged to become wise and a philosopher.²² In this way,

teacher and preceptor to his own children” (Ševčenko’s translation with a suggestion on the chronology of perhaps c. 873–5). Cf. above, p. 188 with n. 3.

19. T. ANTONOPOULOU, The date of Theognostos’ *Orthography*: a reappraisal, *BZ* 103, 2010, pp. 1–12. The dedication to Leo VI is rejected without discussion by W. TREADGOLD, *The middle Byzantine historians*, New York 2013, p. 79 n. 8, who suggests that Theognostos cannot have been so “extraordinarily long-lived”; this was not the case, however, since Theognostos would have been in his seventies at the time of the dedication, and certainly other contemporaries, Photios included, lived as long or longer. On the contrary, P. MAGDALINO, Knowledge in authority and authorised history: the imperial intellectual programme of Leo VI and Constantine VII, in *Authority in Byzantium*, ed. by P. Armstrong, Farnham, Surrey 2013, pp. 187–209, esp. 189 appears convinced; also in agreement is A. SCHMINCK, Subsiciva Byzantina, *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis* 83, 2015, pp. 126–44, esp. “1, Zur ‘constitutio’ Βασιλικῆς”, pp. 126–32, esp. 130–2 with n. 25.

20. See *Life of Nicetas David* 26, ll. 38–40, ed. B. FLUSIN, Un fragment inédit de la vie d’Euthyme le patriarche? 1, Texte et introduction, *TM* 9, 1986, pp. 119–31, esp. 125; cf. Id., Un fragment inédit de la vie d’Euthyme le patriarche? 2, Vie d’Euthyme ou vie de Nicétas?, *TM* 10, 1987, pp. 233–60, esp. 253 with n. 121. On the possible connection of the anonymous author of this text with the monastery of St. Lazarus, a foundation of Leo VI destined for eunuchs, see SCHMINCK, *Studien* (quoted n. 9), p. 107 n. 342; cf. FLUSIN, Un fragment inédit. 2, p. 260 n. 157; C. MESSIS, Régions, politique et rhétorique dans la première moitié du 10^e siècle : le cas des Paphlagoniens, *REB* 73, 2015, pp. 99–122, esp. 120.

21. TOUGHER, *The reign of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 110–132 (chap. 5: The reality of Leo the Wise), which expands on Id., The wisdom of Leo VI, in *New Constantines : the rhythm of imperial renewal in Byzantium, 4th–13th centuries*, ed. by P. Magdalino, Aldershot 1994, pp. 171–9. See also J. SHEPARD, The ruler as instructor, pastor and wise : Leo VI of Byzantium and Symeon of Bulgaria, in *Alfred the Great : papers from the eleventh-centenary conferences*, ed. by T. Reuter, Aldershot 2003, pp. 339–58.

22. *Second paraenesis*, PG 107, col. 57a; text repr. in [Βασίλειος Α΄ Μακεδών], Δύο παραινετικά κείμενα προς τον αυτοκράτορα Λέοντα Σ’ τον Σοφό, εισαγωγή, μετάφραση, σχόλια, K. Δ. Σ. Παϊδας [K. D. S. Païdas] (Κείμενα βυζαντινής λογοτεχνίας 5), Αθήνα 2009, pp. 244–56, esp. 246. This short text, which was due to a ghost-writer for the illiterate Basil, has been dated with probability to 886,

Basil and his son would resemble the Old Testament model kings David and Solomon respectively. Moreover, reexamination of the available but overlooked or downplayed evidence rightly brought to the fore two issues: on the one hand, the prophetic aura that surrounded Leo in his own lifetime, with successful predictions being attributed to him in the sources, and on the other hand, his related interest in astronomy. Tougher also conveniently gathered evidence from sources which suggests Leo's inner, Christian wisdom, derived from his piety and fear of God, as opposed to an outer wisdom in secular matters.²³

Unequivocal as the testimony of Leo's contemporaries is regarding Leo's multifarious wisdom, the internal testimony of his own works has been presented only in part and in a scattered manner in various publications, with the result that the erudition for which the emperor was famed remains unclear to the modern eye. For this reason and in order to elucidate the range of the emperor's readings, profane and Christian, as revealed in his works, it would be useful to bring together and build on the available knowledge. Within this framework, it is worth concentrating especially on what is perhaps the most significant reason for the exclusion of Leo from the revival of learning in Lemerle's presentation: the aforementioned accusation of his lack of knowledge of classical culture, a problem with which I have also dealt in a previous article.²⁴ At the same time, this examination will provide a picture of the texts circulating in his time. Unfortunately, it is impossible to identify his own hand as having copied texts or scholia in surviving manuscripts, although it is well known that he practised calligraphy.²⁵ The presentation that follows, although somewhat hampered by the lack of critical editions of certain of his works, is facilitated by recent critical editions and studies with indications of sources other than the Bible.

The best known cases used to be Leo's legal and military works, which had been studied of old and which have continued to generate interest on the part of historians. Of the two military treatises, that is the *Problematika* (*[Military] problems*) and the *Tactica* (*Tactical constitutions* or treatise on military tactics), the former, early work recasts the contents of the *Strategicon* of Maurice in question and answer form, while the latter, mature handbook relies heavily on the same Maurice. The recent edition of and commentary on

just before Leo ascended the throne; see A. MARKOPOULOS, Autour des *Chapitres parénétiques* de Basile I^{er}, in *Εὐψυχία : mélanges offerts à Hélène Ahrweiler* (Byzantina Sorbonensis 16), Paris 1998, vol. 2, pp. 469–79, esp. 474–5; repr. in Id., *History and literature* (quoted n. 10), no. XXI; cf. PAÏDAS, *Δύο παραινετικά κείμενα*, pp. 89–98.

23. On Leo's wisdom and the importance of the Solomonic role model for him, which combined lawgiving, preaching and a reputation for interest in the occult, see recently MAGDALINO, Knowledge in authority (quoted n. 19), pp. 196–7; and pp. 189–90 for a brief overview of his works and the projects he commissioned as a basis for his reputation; cf. below, pp. 219–21. Also, on Leo as a new David, see B. FLUSIN, Construire une nouvelle Jérusalem : Constantinople et les reliques, in *L'Orient dans l'histoire religieuse de l'Europe : l'invention des origines*, éd. par M. A. Amir-Moezzi et J. Scheid (Bibliothèque de l'École des hautes études. Section des sciences religieuses 110), Turnhout 2000, pp. 51–70, esp. 66.

24. T. ANTONOPOULOU, Ancient Greek authors in Byzantium : the case of the *Homilies* of the emperor Leo VI, in *Αντιφίλησις : studies on classical, Byzantine and modern Greek literature and culture in honour of John-Theophanes A. Papademetriou*, ed. by E. Karamalengou and E. Makrygianni, Stuttgart 2009, pp. 551–7.

25. This is testified by a famous passage of the *Life of St. Blasios of Amorion*; see AASS Novembris IV, 1925, pp. 657–69, esp. 666E. Cf., e.g., ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), p. 50 with previous bibliography.

the *Tactica* have shown that the work also draws on a limited number of other military sources, that is the first- and second-century authors Onasander, Aelian, and Polyaenus, and the ninth-century Syrianos *magistros*. A number of gnomic sources, such as on military issues or the *Advisory chapters* (*First paraenesis*) addressed to him in the name of Basil I, but arguably composed by Photios, were probably at hand. By contrast, quotations from ancient texts mentioned in the *apparatus fontium* of the edition have been proved to be second-hand. Notably, the Bible is cited on several occasions, which is in accordance with the Christian moralising character of the emperor’s guidelines on warfare.²⁶ Leo’s active interest in military matters led to the dedication to him of a manuscript of Urbicius’ *Tacticon*, as revealed by the surviving dedicatory epigram.²⁷

Regarding the *Novels*, a remarkable familiarity with the Justinianic and other previous imperial legislation as well as with the sacred and ecclesiastical canons is manifest. Such familiarity was necessary given that Leo was eager to revise or abolish existing legal provisions, for example in order to replace them with custom or in order to eliminate differences with church canons in favour of the latter and in accordance with the decisions of the councils of the seventh and eighth centuries.²⁸ The study of the *Novels* has also revealed Leo’s use of the comments of the antecessor Theophilos on Justinian’s *Code*.²⁹

Coming to Leo’s expanded religious oeuvre, one should start by noting that in his admirable article on some of Leo VI’s works, published in *Travaux et mémoires* more than forty years ago, José GROS DIDIER de MATONS came up with a sensational discovery, the veiled use of the Hippocratic *Aphorisms* in the *Pattern of guidance for souls* (*Oἰακιστικὴ ψυχῶν ὑποτύπωσις; De instituendis monachis* or *De administratione animarum*). In particular, the emperor silently adapted the *Aphorisms* to suit his instruction to monks for the well-being of their souls.³⁰ The availability in Leo’s time of the Hippocratic work, together with

26. The recent critical edition of the *Tactica* by DENNIS is accompanied by a useful *Index fontium*. This is complemented by the detailed commentary of HALDON, *A critical commentary* (quoted n. 14), as well as the section of his Introduction dedicated to “Sources”, pp. 39–55.

27. See AL. CAMERON, *The Greek anthology from Meleager to Planudes*, Oxford 1993, pp. 149–50 for the dedicatee (with reproduction of the text); M. D. LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine poetry from Pisides to Geometres. 1, Texts and contexts* (WBS 24, 1), Wien 2003, p. 355.

28. References to the underlying previous legislation and sacred canons are incorporated in the modern Greek translation accompanying the recent edition of the *Novels* by TROIANOS; see also, for example, the introduction, pp. 27–8 (on church canons); and the conclusions of K. A. ΜΠΟΥΡΔΑΡΑ [K. A. BOURDARA], *Η διάκριση των φύλων ως κριτήριο στις ρυθμίσεις των νεαρών Λέοντος ΣΤ΄ Σοφού* (Forschungen zur byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte. Athener Reihe 19), Αθήνα 2011, pp. 185–6 (on custom).

29. M. T. FÖGEN, Leon liest Theophilos : eine Exegese der Novellen 24–27 des Kaisers Leon VI, *Subseciva Groningana* 4, 1990 (= *Novella Constitutio : studies in honour of Nicolaas van der Wal*), pp. 83–97.

30. This discovery, however, came out too late to be taken into account by Lemerle; see J. GROS DIDIER DE MATONS, *Trois études sur Léon VI. 1, L’homélie de Léon VI sur le sacre du patriarche Étienne. 2, Hippocrate et Léon VI : remarques sur l’Oἰακιστικὴ ψυχῶν ὑποτύπωσις. 3, Les constitutions tactiques et la *damnatio memoriae* de l’empereur Alexandre*, *TM* 5, 1973, pp. 181–242, esp. 206–28. Edition of the Greek text in A. PAPADOPoulos-KERAMEUS, *Variae Graeca sacra*, St. Petersburg 1909, pp. 213–53 with 298–302 (“Variae lectiones”); repr. (*Subsidia Byzantina lucis ope iterata* 6), Leipzig 1975. New edition and French translation of the preface of the work in GROS DIDIER DE MATONS, *Trois études*, pp. 213–5.

the *Commentary* of Stephanus on it, is attested by a still extant manuscript.³¹ Further study of the *Guidance* should reveal more of the author's sources. As I have suggested elsewhere, one of them was a hugely popular seventh-century work, the *Heavenly ladder* of John Climacus, which provided Leo with the inspiration for composing an ascetic treatise, structuring it in a symbolic way, and using an obscure style and accompanying interpretative scholia.³² Leo's familiarity with the *Ladder* is proved by his two scholia on this work, which I published a few years ago, together with his remaining three theological scholia, which commented on certain New Testament passages related to St. Paul. Whereas good knowledge of the Bible as a whole also comes forth in Leo's other works, and is to be expected, commenting on the *Ladder* underlines Leo's ascetic interests.³³

Nevertheless, the best source to detect and evaluate Leo's literary readings and, therefore, extrapolate on his education, is his *Homilies*. The extent of this large corpus of forty-two texts, which covers 600 pages in the critical edition, together with the systematic tracing of their sources, which are indicated in the *apparatus fontium et locorum parallelorum* and in the text in a variety of ways—depending on whether we encounter exact quotations, adaptations, or simple parallels—, allows the drawing of a most telling picture.³⁴

To restrict ourselves to the indication of exact quotations and sure adaptations, which are the most unequivocal group of sources, it emerges that Leo did not seem to care for exact quotations. Only in some of his hagiographical *Homilies* does he cite phrases from the underlying hagiographical sources to a noteworthy degree. In addition, he does so more frequently in the homily on John Chrysostom, which is his earliest surviving work (no. 38, dated as early as November 882) and in the likewise early homily on the Translation of Chrysostom's relics (no. 41, which can be dated to January 883), and less so in his later, more mature works.³⁵ Several groups of quotations can be discerned, those from classical authors, Christian authors mostly down to the sixth century, Photios, liturgical hymnography, and proverbs. Other quotations exist but are rather isolated, such as from the Credo of Nicaea-Constantinople, the Liturgy, and Maurice's *Srategicon* (*Hom.* 13, 108–9).

31. This is *Escorial* Σ.II.10; see WILSON, *Scholars*, p. 136; for recent bibliography on the codex see the Pinakes database at <http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/cote/15361/>.

32. T. ANTONOPOULOU, Unpublished scholia on the apostle Paul and John Climacus by the emperor Leo VI, in *Byzantinische Sprachkunst : Studien zur byzantinischen Literatur gewidmet Wolfram Hörandner zum 65. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von M. Hinterberger und E. Schiffer (Byzantinisches Archiv 20), Berlin – New York 2007, pp. 20–34, esp. 31–3.

33. Scholia I–III on passages from the Acts, the Epistle to the Romans and the First Epistle to the Corinthians respectively, and IV–V on the *Ladder*, ed. ANTONOPOULOU, Unpublished scholia (quoted n. 32), pp. 23, 25–6, 28–9.

34. In the edition of the *Homilies* (*Leonis VI Homiliae* [quoted n. 14]), following the practice in the *Corpus Christianorum*, a single Index contains both the sources and the *loci parallelī* (except for the Bible, for which a separate index is reserved). Since this practice does not allow the immediate appreciation of the author's identified sources, it is worth presenting them here, while leaving aside the parallel passages. The usefulness of the latter for the understanding of the text is that they provide early and/or particularly important attestations of phrases or thoughts and testify to their popularity.

35. On the dating of the *Homilies* and the sources on which each of them depends in terms of contents, structure and themes, see ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 52–71, 116–260, esp. the Tables on 69 (dating) and 255 (sources). Cf. below, p. 201 with nn. 64–5.

To begin with the classical authors, Leo had a noteworthy knowledge of ancient literature, despite Vogt’s declaration. As I have shown in my aforementioned article,³⁶ this is proved beyond doubt by the identification of a number of passages from various ancient Greek authors, which Leo knew either directly or indirectly, consciously inserting passages from their works into his own. These quotations, the most striking of which are derivative, drawn from intermediate sources, are of special interest for the reception of these authors and the particular passages in medieval times.

As could be expected, Homer tops the list with six quotations. However, nowhere is the poet mentioned by name. On one occasion, Leo makes a vague reference to an ancient source, and the same passage is referred to a second time with a similarly vague reference.³⁷ His familiarity with Homer is confirmed by a quotation he uses in a conversation with Euthymios as reported in the latter’s *Vita*.³⁸ Pindar follows suit with four quotations, two of which give an indication of provenance.³⁹ These two quotations, which occur in *Homilies* 14 (the *Funeral oration* for Leo’s parents) and 21, concern, in reality, the same passage of Pindar, the second time used in a form that betrays its indirect provenance via Gregory of Nazianzus. In fact, while Gregory has ὑποστήσαντες εὐτυχεῖ [read εὔτειχεῖ] θαλάμῳ χρυσέας κίονας, ὃ φησι Πίνδαρος, at *Homily* 21, 424–5 Leo has θαλάμῳ εὐτειχεῖ κίονας ὑποστῆσαι, ὃ φησιν ἡ Θηβαία λύρα. On the contrary, at *Homily* 14, 123–4 he writes: κατὰ τὸν Θηβαῖον μελοποιόν, τῷ προθύρῳ τοῦ ἔργου τῶν ἐγκωμίων ὑπέστησαν κίονες.⁴⁰ As proved by the use of προθύρῳ, which is not in Gregory, Leo must have known Pindar directly or via a third source. However, when he composed *Homily* 21, he drew on Gregory as his intermediary source. He also took over Athenaeus’ reference to Pindar as the “musician from Thebes” (Θηβαῖον μελοποιόν). Apart from the four cases noted, there is a vague reference to the “lineage of the poets” (*Hom.* 37, 177–8 τὸ ποιητικὸν γένος). Although no exact quotation is used, the passage can be traced back to Pindar’s *Isthmionic* VI 63–4. Aristophanes’ *Plutus* and Lycophron’s *Alexandra*, both well-known in Byzantium, are quoted without indication of provenance in *Homily* 38 (ll. 820 and 821–2, 824–5 respectively).

Furthermore, there are some notable citations of other, occasionally rare, texts. At least a few of these citations must have been drawn from surviving intermediary witnesses. At *Homily* 26, 578–80, a passage two and a half verses long, which can be identified as frg. 138 of the *adespota* of Kock’s *Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta*, was preserved by Eusebius in

36. ANTONOPOULOU, Ancient Greek authors (quoted n. 24).

37. *Hom.* 9, 378–9 “οὐ δέκα” μόνον “γλῶσσαι”, οὐδὲ ισάριθμα “στόματα”, ὃ τινι τῶν ἄνω τοῦ χρόνου εἴρηται (*Il.* 2, 489) and *Hom.* 21, 352–3 Παλαιὸν ἔπος διεμνημόνευσα, ὃ πλήθει τινὶ “δέκα στομάτων” ἔλεγε δεῖν. The other references are: *Hom.* 24, 361 (the Iliadic phrase τότε μοι χάνοι εὐρεῖα χθόνι in the form καί μοι γῆ χάνοι); *Hom.* 38, 824–5 (see *Il.* 16, 235 for ἀνιπτόποδας ὑποφῆτας); *Hom.* 41, 162 (see *Od.* 9, 68 and 12, 314 for θεσπεσίη λαίλαπι) and 198 (see *Od.* 7, 36 for ὧσεὶ πτερὸν ἡὲ νόημα). Some of these phrases had certainly become common-trade by Leo’s time.

38. It is a short sentence from the *Iliad* (6, 448 ἔσσεται ἴμαρ); see the *Vita Euthymii* 7, p. 41,9.

39. *Hom.* 4, 78–80 (*Olymp.* I 40 and 52); *Hom.* 14, 124 (*Olymp.* VI 1–2); *Hom.* 20, 77 (πολυυχρύσων θαλάμων; found twice in Pindar, at *Pyth.* IX 68–69, where the singular form is used, and frg. 221,3 where the plural is used); and *Hom.* 21, 424–5 (see *Hom.* 14; commented upon in the main text).

40. For this observation, see ANTONOPOULOU, Ancient Greek authors (quoted n. 24), p. 553 with n. 12.

his *Praeparatio evangelica*, Leo's probable source. At *Homily* 14, 359, a passage from the rhetor Demades (frg. 18), which has come down to us via Demetrius' *Περὶ ἐρμηνείας* and Photios' *Lexicon*, is employed, the latter possibly, but not necessarily, being Leo's source. At *Homily* 10, 193–9, a myth from Ctesias' *Persica* may have been drawn either directly from him or via its quotation in Diodorus Siculus' *Bibliotheca historica*, with two words from the original being preserved by Leo.⁴¹ Furthermore, a phrase from Diodorus is quoted at *Homily* 23, 126–7, where reference is made to the ancient author in vague terms: ὡς τις παρ' Ἑλλήστιν ἐπὶ σοφίᾳ σεμνὸς ἔφη.⁴² Leo was also familiar with Aelian's *De natura animalium* and *Varia historia*, as proved by certain passages in the *ecphrasis* of the spring in *Homily* 31 (ll. 125–9 and 133–4 respectively), which even preserve two scattered words from the source. It is noteworthy that the passage from the *Varia historia* contains a fragment of Hesiod (frg. 312 Merkelsbach – West). It is known from elsewhere that Demetrios, Ctesias, Diodorus and Aelian were available in Constantinople in the ninth and/or tenth centuries, in the times of Photios, Leo and Constantine VII.⁴³ In addition to the quotation from Athenaeus mentioned above, another expression of the same author also occurs at *Homily* 38, 1025 (ἀνερρίπτε τὸ δεινόν, whereas the *Life of John Chrysostom* by George of Alexandria, Leo's immediate source for *Homily* 38, has πρᾶγμα κακὸν ... ἀνερρίπτεν). Moreover, gnomologies, anthologies and lexica, can be envisaged in many other cases as sources of various expressions, without excluding the author's occasional recourse to the original works. Such could be the case, for example, with Moschos' word θεόταυρος at *Homily* 4, 53, and Euripides' *Hecuba* at *Homily* 42, 344. As posited in my earlier article, Leo "had read a considerable number of ancient Greek texts without confining himself to the school curriculum, as suggested by the use of Diodorus and Aelian... On the other hand, he was not a scholar himself nor did he pretend to be one".

The number of ancient and profane texts at Leo's disposal increases considerably when non verbatim quotations are taken into account. These include, for example, the indirect reference to Pindar mentioned above; a reminiscence from the *Images* of Philostratus the Elder (*Hom.* 37, 162–4); and another from Lucian's *De domo* at the beginning of *Homily* 37 (ll. 5–11), where a veiled reference to the source as "the old saying" and "the saying" (ὁ παλαιὸς μῦθος ... τοῦ μύθου) is encountered. Other possible reminiscences from the same text also occur elsewhere in the Homilies (at *Hom.* 37, 150–68 and *Hom.* 31, 43–5 and 73–4).

It should be mentioned that Xenophon has not left any verbal traces in the Homilies, but Leo owned a copy of his *Cyropaedia* and *Anabasis*. A book epigram, thirty verses

41. On these citations and their possible sources, see ANTONOPOULOU, Ancient Greek authors (quoted n. 24), pp. 554–5.

42. It cannot be entirely ruled out that the phrase comes from Theodore's *Graecarum affectionum curatio* III 26, p. 177,9, ed.: Théodore de Cyr, *Thérapeutique des maladies helléniques*, texte critique, trad., notes et index par P. Canivet (SC 57), I, Paris 1958, in combination with III 30, p. 178,4–6 on Dionysos as inventor of wine, which is Leo's topic, and III 28, p. 177,16–8, where Theodore notes, with regard to other ancient gods and heroes: Καὶ ταῦτα πρὸς ἑτέροις πολλῷ ὁ Σικελιώτης Διόδωρος ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ τῶν βιβλιοθηκῶν ξυνέγραψεν. It is simpler, however, to assume a direct reading of Diodorus.

43. On the use of Aelian, see ANTONOPOULOU, Ancient Greek authors (quoted n. 24), pp. 555–6. For an investigation of the availability of the authors in question in Leo's times, see *ibid.*, pp. 554–6.

long, which accompanied the presentation of the now lost manuscript to the emperor, has survived. It has plausibly been suggested that Leo read these works while composing the *Funeral oration*, not least on the basis of Basil's fabricated Arsacid royal ancestry going back to Artaxerxes, the grandfather of Cyrus the Younger, which is propagated in the *Oration*.⁴⁴

Leo also made use of Menander Rhetor's instructions while composing the *Funeral oration* and some of the hagiographical homilies (nos. 9 on St. Paul, 21 on St. Nicholas, 24 on St. Stephen, 27 on St. Trypho, and 38 on St. John Chrysostom).⁴⁵ He himself refers to the “laws of the encomium,” which, he purports, it is not necessary to follow in the case of the persons lauded, only to abide by them after all.

Another source which Leo drew from was proverbs or proverbial phrases. These may have been taken from the works of various authors or collections of proverbs, similar to those that have come down to us. In one case (*Hom.* 38, 101 f.), the proverb was certainly second-hand, derived from Leos' immediate source, George of Alexandria.

Of special significance is Leo's wide knowledge of ancient myths, which he drew from both non-Christian and Christian sources. His primary source was actually Christian, that is Theodoret of Cyrrhus' *Cure of pagan maladies* (*Graecarum affectionum curatio*). Leo would most probably have used this work as his basic handbook, as becomes evident by a sheer look at the *apparatus fontium* of Leo's four homilies with sections on ancient myths. He supplemented Theodoret, partly by drawing on the selection found in those orations of Gregory of Nazianzus that contain myths, the invectives against Julian (Orations 4 and 5) in particular. It is worth noting the interest in Gregory's classical references in this period, as evidenced by the earliest surviving manuscript of the popular sixth-century *Commentaries* of Ps.-Nonnus, which dates from the late ninth century.⁴⁶ Furthermore, Ps.-Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* seems to have also been in the emperor's hands, since several common-trade myths, which are notably absent from Theodoret and Gregory, are conveniently gathered there. In his *Bibliotheca*, Photios does not deal with the work of Theodoret in question, but mentions Ps.-Apollodorus, thus verifying the availability of his work.⁴⁷ Moreover, certain myths encountered in the homilies are absent from the two main handbooks, but are known from various other sources (such as different ancient authors mentioned above), whereas occasionally none of those works can be pinpointed with certainty as Leo's source (e.g. *Hom.* 10, 213 f.). In a particularly noteworthy case, Leo utilized a myth from Pindar, partly couched in the poet's vocabulary (*Hom.* 4, 75–80).

As I have argued elsewhere, like other homilists of the late ninth and tenth centuries, Leo had a number of reasons to employ myths in the *Homilies*. By doing so, he followed in

44. MARKOPOULOS, Αποσημειώσεις (quoted n. 11), pp. 193–8 with the poem on p. 195; also, LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine poetry* (quoted n. 27), pp. 208–212, who dates the epigram to 904. For the manuscript of the poem, *Paris. gr. 1640*, see now P. GÉHIN *et al.*, *Les manuscrits grecs datés des XIII^e et XIV^e siècles conservés dans les bibliothèques publiques de France*, II, Paris – Turnhout 2005, pp. 51–3.

45. See index to the edition, s.v. Menander Rhetor.

46. On these *Commentaries*, see *Pseudo-Nonniani in IV orationes Gregorii Nazianzeni commentarii*, ed. a J. Nimmo Smith (CCSG 27 – Corpus Nazianzenum 2), Turnhout 1992, esp. p. 17; *A Christian's guide to Greek culture : the Pseudo-Nonnus Commentaries on Sermons 4, 5, 39 and 43 by Gregory of Nazianzus*, transl. with an introd. and notes by J. Nimmo Smith (Translated texts for historians 37), Liverpool 2001, esp. p. xlvi on the date of the earliest manuscript.

47. See cod. 186, Photius, *Bibliothèque*. 3, pp. 39–40, ll. 37–41. 1–14.

the footsteps of Gregory of Nazianzus and Photios, both of whom had incorporated myths in their homilies with a similarly polemical purpose against ancient religion. He also responded to the revived interest in rhetoric from the ninth century onwards and to a need to renovate the homiletic genre in terms of contents and style. In addition, in this way, Leo displayed his erudition and knowledge of classical antiquity, which was appreciated by his audience. The use of myths testifies to a persistent resurgence of classicism, which will also resurface within homiletic contexts in later times. Most interestingly, Leo focused especially on myths with erotic content and unhappy end, a choice which mirrors his personal tastes and fascination with certain topics as well as reflecting the tastes of his contemporaries, as proved by corresponding artistic developments in tenth-century minor arts.⁴⁸

Mythological *exempla* were judged appropriate for the flock, even if, or rather exactly because their content was overshadowed by the polemical purpose of their use.⁴⁹ Nonetheless, even their negative usage points to future developments. With regard to a later historical and literary framework, it has plausibly been suggested that the positive use of myths in Comnenian times was a fundamental step towards the emergence of fiction.⁵⁰ Here, I would like to take this argument a step further and suggest that this development did not appear suddenly and following Psellos, but had been announced, among other texts, already in the sermons of Photios, Leo and other homilists of the tenth century. It is no coincidence that in the tenth century a number of fictitious Lives of saints appear, such as those of Theoktiste of Lesbos and Andrew the Fool.⁵¹ Moreover, an interest in

48. T. ANTONOPOULOU, “What agreement has the temple of God with idols?” Christian homilies, ancient myths, and the “Macedonian Renaissance”, *BZ* 106, 2013, pp. 595–620, esp. 602–3, 609–20, drawing on around 200 homilies from the late ninth to the end of the tenth century. Cf. also S. EFTHYMIADIS, Le “premier classicisme byzantin”: mythes grecs et réminiscences païennes chez Photios, Léon VI le Sage et Aréthas, in *Pour l’amour de Byzance: hommage à Paolo Odorico*, éd. par C. Gastgeber, C. Messis, D. I. Mureşan et F. Ronconi (Eastern and Central European studies 3), Frankfurt am Main 2012, pp. 99–114, esp. 109–12.

49. It is interesting to note that in the first edition of *Hom. 28* by F. Combefis (1648), which was reproduced in *PG* 107, the mythological digression (ll. 51–110) is absent altogether. This omission, however, was due to the editor’s exemplar, codex *Paris. gr. 773*, a homiliary of the fifteenth century, where the omission was obviously dictated by moral considerations on the part of the compiler and/or the copyist; see ANTONOPOULOU, *Leonis VI Homiliae* (quoted n. 14), p. cxv on the manuscript, p. ccxix on the 1648 edition, and p. 387 for the relevant apparatus criticus. In none of the other manuscripts of the *Homilies* containing myths does such a choice occur.

50. See to this effect, A. KALDELLIS, The emergence of literary fiction in Byzantium and the paradox of plausibility, in *Medieval Greek storytelling: fictionality and narrative in Byzantium*, ed. by P. Roilos (Mainzer Veröffentlichungen zur Byzantinistik 12), Wiesbaden 2014, pp. 115–40, esp. 125–6. On twelfth-century narrative, see recently I. NILSSON, *Raconter Byzance: la littérature au XII^e siècle* (Séminaires byzantins 3), Paris 2014.

51. See, for example, recently S. EFTHYMIADIS, Hagiography from the “Dark Age” to the age of Symeon Metaphrastes (eighth–tenth centuries), in *The Ashgate research companion to Byzantine hagiography. 1, Periods and places*, ed. by S. Efthymiadis, Farnham – Burlington VT 2011, pp. 95–142, esp. 125–8 (“Constantinopolitan hagiographical fiction”); C. MESSIS, Fiction and/or novelisation in Byzantine hagiography, in *The Ashgate research companion to Byzantine hagiography. 2* (quoted n. 13), pp. 313–41 with bibliography.

late antique novels is attested by Photios' *Bibliotheca*.⁵² Thus, sermons and hagiography testify to an emerging timid but real interest in fiction in the form of mythology during the late ninth and tenth centuries. Such interest was limited by religion and the notion of the theological falsehood of ancient gods, and had, therefore, to be invested with the accepted norms of religious texts. Sheer fiction would have to wait until the end of the eleventh century in order to be put into non-religious usage. It appears, therefore, that Leo expressed contemporary, although premature sensibilities towards fiction and was at the forefront of new quests.

Apart from profane authors and late antique mythological sources, Leo had also acquired considerable knowledge of patristic Christian literature down to the sixth century. Quite expectedly and not only because of what was noted above concerning the usage of myths, Gregory of Nazianzus is the author quoted *par excellence*.⁵³ Leo cites him verbatim on numerous occasions, his *Orations* in particular, more than any other author, secular or Christian. He quotes short expressions with a theological significance or interesting in other respects—such as the sentimental Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἐμός—, which he occasionally embeds in larger passages inspired by Gregory.⁵⁴ It is not coincidental that *Homily* 38 contains the largest number of Gregory's quotations. This is not just related to the fact that it is the longest of all surviving *Homilies*, but, as mentioned above, also because it is the earliest of them all. Similarly, *Homily* 41, the second earliest, begins and ends with direct quotations from Gregory's *Orations*. In particular, the whole epilogue (*Hom.* 41, 319–27) draws heavily on phrases from them. Thus, in these works Leo betrays his school formation, in the framework of which Gregory's “read-out” homilies (ἀναγινωσκόμενοι λόγοι) must have played a major part. Leo even refers to his source once as τὸ θεολογούμενον (l. 66) and on another occasion most clearly as τῆς Θεολόγου Γρηγορίου βροντῆς (l. 1100). It is also worth mentioning a quotation from the *Life of Gregory of Nazianzus* by the presbyter Gregory.⁵⁵

A further significant case is presented by Theodoret of Cyrrhus, since, as explained above, Leo was especially familiar with his *Cure of pagan maladies*, having read carefully the myths it contains. Theodoret's work surfaces again occasionally in expressions outside

52. P. AGAPITOS, Narrative, rhetoric and “drama” rediscovered : scholars and poets in Byzantium interpret Heliodorus, in *Studies in Heliodorus*, ed. by R. HUNTER (Cambridge Philological Society, Supplementary volume 21), Cambridge 1998, pp. 125–56, esp. 128–32.

53. On the popularity of Gregory of Nazianzus in Byzantium, see J. NORET, Grégoire de Nazianze, l'auteur le plus cité, après la Bible, dans la littérature ecclésiastique byzantine, in *II. Symposium Nazianzenum, Louvain-la-Neuve, 25–28 août 1981*, éd. par J. Mossay (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums. Forschungen zu Gregor von Nazianz 2), Paderborn 1983, pp. 259–66; A. RHOBY, Aspekte des Fortlebens des Gregor von Nazianz in byzantinischer und postbyzantinischer Zeit, in *Theatron : rhetorische Kultur in Spätantike und Mittelalter*, hrsg. von M. Grünbart (Millenium studies 13), Berlin 2007, pp. 409–17.

54. See the quotations at *Hom.* 1, 57; *Hom.* 5, 8. 69; *Hom.* 6, 45; *Hom.* 8, 435; *Hom.* 12, 49; *Hom.* 15, 85. 179. 237; *Hom.* 20, 120 f.; *Hom.* 21, 236 f. 377. 424 f. 448. 464 (the latter also in Gregory of Nyssa); *Hom.* 22, 106; *Hom.* 24, 321; *Hom.* 25, 4–10; *Hom.* 27, 285 f.; *Hom.* 28, 17; *Hom.* 35, 73 f.; *Hom.* 37, 197 f.; *Hom.* 38, 5–9. 16 f. 64–6. 365. 427. 443. 640 f. 742–4. 819–21. 1087–9. 1101–3. 1108 f. 1351 f. 1613; *Hom.* 39, 19; *Hom.* 41, 5. 7. 13 f. 21 f. 76 f. 173. 271–4. 319–27; *Hom.* 42, 313.

55. *Hom.* 41, 16. 20 f.

the mythological digressions.⁵⁶ Once Leo mentions Theodoret by name (*Hom.* 38, 907 f.) in order to expressly recommend his *Ecclesiastical history* to those in the audience interested in the story of the Arian Gainas, a reference which does not derive from Leo's source, the *Life of Chrysostom* by George of Alexandria. On another occasion, Leo quotes an expression from Theodoret's *Interpretation of Jeremiah*, which he combines with a Homeric quotation (*Hom.* 41, 162 f.). In relation to the above, it should be noted that a few years ago a book epigram consisting of twenty verses, which concerns the dedication to Leo of a manuscript of the *Cure of pagan maladies* by a certain Peter the Patrician, a former associate of Basil I's, was published. This dedication was on the occasion of the emperor's Brumalia.⁵⁷ At the time of the publication of the epigram it was impossible to find a connection to Leo's interests and literary works. The critical edition of the *Homilies* now allows the appreciation of the relevance of this lost manuscript to Leo, since he was an avid reader of the work in question, a preference that made the book an appropriate gift for him. Thus, the wish of the donor, that every year he may keep bringing to the emperor books he loves (προσφιλῆ σοι προσκομίζειν βιβλία), corresponds to reality, at least for the year of the dedication.

A number of other early Christian and late antique works were also used. The apocryphal *Protevangelium Iacobi*, which had gained acceptance for the story of the birth and infancy of the Theotokos, was certainly at hand, especially in *Homilies* 15 and 20 on the Birth of the Virgin and her Presentation at the Temple. Expressions from various works of Gregory of Nyssa are present in the *Homilies*,⁵⁸ together with a more substantial, although not verbatim, use of his encomium of Stephen the First Martyr in Leo's *Homily* 24 on the same subject, some passages of which were certainly inspired by Gregory's text.⁵⁹ A notable case is the pseudo-Areopagitic corpus, as short expressions from these well-known works are used verbatim, while passages on angelology in particular, betray the influence of *On celestial hierarchy*.⁶⁰

Special mention should be made of the sixth-century rhetor Choricius of Gaza, whom Leo read first-hand, especially the *First oration to Bishop Marcian*, as testified by two of the *Homilies* (no. 31, 37; no. 37, 99, 134). On the contrary, the quotation of a *gnome* from the *Second oration to Marcian* may well have been second-hand (*Hom.* 42, 343). Choricius' works were known to Photios, who dedicated codex 160 of his *Bibliotheca* to them.⁶¹ Moreover, the *Florilegium Marcianum*, a gnomology which its editor dated to

56. At *Hom.* 38, 150 and *Hom.* 6, 133; perhaps also at *Hom.* 2, 261 f. and *Hom.* 14, 352, but the relevant expressions occur in other works as well.

57. See MARKOPOULOS, Έπιγραμμα (quoted n. 10), with the text of the epigram on pp. 34–5; see ID., Addenda et corrigenda, in ID., *History and literature* (quoted n. 10), pp. 1–10, esp. 9 for the necessary correction of the edition's βιβλίον to βιβλία; cf. also on this epigram, LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine poetry* (quoted n. 27), pp. 208–9; and below, pp. 219–20 with n. 157.

58. *Hom.* 16, 110; *Hom.* 21, 464 (also in Gregory of Nazianzus); *Hom.* 33, 109; *Hom.* 36, 9; *Hom.* 37, 85 f.; *Hom.* 38, 727 f.; *Hom.* 41, 101 f.

59. ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 139–43.

60. Quotations: *Hom.* 7, 21 f. 32 f.; *Hom.* 23, 35 f. 261; *Hom.* 28, 249; *Hom.* 37, 77; angelology: *Hom.* 37, 59–67, 75–7, 79 f. 83.

61. On cod. 160, see recently E. AMATO, The fortune and reception of Choricius and of his works, in *Rhetorical exercises from late antiquity: a translation of Choricius of Gaza's Preliminary talks*

the mid-ninth century,⁶² contains *sententiae* from the two *Orations to Marcian*, which, however, do not overlap with the passages Leo used. The *Orations* in question have come down to us in a single manuscript.⁶³ For this reason, Leo occupies a special place in the reception of the Gazaean’s rhetor works and his citations should be considered as an important part of the indirect tradition of this author.

A number of anonymous and eponymous hagiographical works underlie certain *Homilies* on saints. Anonymous, still surviving *Passions* were used for the compositions on Saints Demetrios, Clement of Ancyra, and Trypho (*Homilies* 17, 26, and 27 respectively). For the *Homily on St. Nicholas* (no. 21), the saint’s “canonical” Life by Michael was used, while Leo knew the *Praxis de stratelatis*. George of Alexandria’s *Life of John Chrysostom* and Cosmas Vestitor’s *Fourth oration on the translation of Chrysostom’s relics* were exploited for the *Homilies* on the respective subjects (nos. 38 and 41). As noted above, Leo quotes his sources verbatim only to a limited extent, more so in the earliest texts on Chrysostom than in the rest. Usually, he adapts passages by changing the wording. While, in general, he follows the structure of the story found in his sources, changes are possible, if they serve particular literary targets.⁶⁴

Naturally, older homilies were also among Leo’s readings and served the composition of his own respective *Homilies*. The *Homily on St. Stephen* (no. 24), which draws on that by Gregory of Nyssa, was mentioned above. It should be underlined that certain familiar homilies, mostly prescribed as liturgical readings in the eleventh century, were certainly or most probably at hand, although it has not always been possible to trace citations. In addition to the *Orations* of Gregory of Nazianzus, particularly noteworthy in this respect are the sermons authored by Basil of Caesarea (employed in *Homilies* 29–30), John Chrysostom (in *Hom.* 5), Sophronios of Jerusalem and Andrew of Crete (in *Hom.* 13), and Constantine the Deacon (in *Hom.* 8).⁶⁵

Furthermore, some of the expressions in the *Homilies* can be traced back to the *Epistle* of Polycarp (*Hom.* 7, 473 f.), various Chrysostomic works (*Hom.* 12, 297; *Hom.* 41, 70), a homily of Ps.-Epiphanios (*Hom.* 4, 331 f.), and an oration of Ps.-Amphilochios or, alternatively, an oration of Ps.-Chrysostom (*Hom.* 8, 230–2). The probable use of Eusebius was noted above in relation to the transmission of a poetic fragment (*Hom.* 26,

and Declamations, ed. by R. J. Penella, Cambridge 2009, pp. 261–302, esp. 270–8. Leo VI should be added to the Byzantine testimonies of Choricius mentioned by Amato.

62. See P. ODORICO, *Il prato e l’ape : il sapere sentenzioso del monaco Giovanni* (WBS 17), Wien 1986. The *sententiae* from Choricius’ *Orations* I–II are nos. 30 (I 16), 121 (I 2), 258 (II 4), 294 (I 42), 335 (I 69). Cf. also AMATO, The fortune and reception of Choricius (quoted n. 61), pp. 265–6 for some further *sententiae* from Choricius, none of which comes from *Orations* I and II; also, p. 278 n. 74.

63. This is Matrit. 4641 (olim N-101) (13th–14th cent.); cf. E. AMATO, Aperçus sur la tradition manuscrite des Discours de Chorikios de Gaza et état de la recherche, in *Gaza dans l’Antiquité tardive : archéologie, rhétorique et histoire : actes du colloque international de Poitiers (6–7 mai 2004)*, éd. par C. Saliou (Cardo 2), Salerno 2005, pp. 93–116, esp. 115.

64. See ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 121–39, as well as 255 for a list of Leo’s sources of his hagiographical encomia. Cf. above, p. 194 with n. 35.

65. See ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 139–230, as well as the list on p. 255 and the *apparatus fontium* to the critical edition of *Homilies* 3–8, 13, 23–5, 28–30, and 42, for the earlier, well-known texts that Leo might have had in mind when composing those *Homilies*, on the basis of shared common motives.

578–80), while Leo possibly had the *Vita Constantini* in mind in the prooemium of *Homily* 38, 10–6.

Hymnography frequently makes its appearance in the *Homilies*. These comprise quotations of phrases and reminiscences from various anonymous *troparia* and *apolytikia* sung in church on various feasts and included in the *Menaea*, the *Pentecostarion*, and the *Triodion*.⁶⁶ Also quoted or implied, are the *Liturgies* of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom, the famous *Akathist hymn*, hymns of Romanos the Melodist, and possibly, Kassia and Joseph the Hymnographer. Leo's familiarity with hymnography is not surprising, since he was an accomplished hymnographer. In a short didactic poem, Nikephoros Kallistou Xanthopoulos lists Leo among the eleven most important Byzantine hymnographers, following such names as John of Damascus and Cosmas of Maiouma.⁶⁷ An extended manuscript tradition of his hymns also testifies to his talent and the recognition he enjoyed.⁶⁸ Especially his *Idiomela troparia* and the eleven *Eothina anastasima* attest to his musical knowledge, since these compositions were set to their own melody. The extent to which Leo might have been assisted by professional musicians is unknown, even though he must have been taught music as part of his school education.⁶⁹ Furthermore, his command of the genre of the canon is evident in a *Paracletic canon* attributed to him, this time set to preexisting music; this work will be dealt with below.⁷⁰ A few more of the emperor's hymns were published recently. Among them, a hymn consisting of a number of *stichera* set to preexisting music, has the unusual peculiarity of commenting on another hymn, the *Great canon* of Andrew of Crete, thus clearly testifying to Leo's familiarity with it. The manuscript tradition attests that the hymn entered liturgical practice very soon after its composition and introduced the performance of the *Great canon*.⁷¹

Finally, a case of the utmost importance among Leo's sources is Photios. Despite the tumultuous relationship between the two men and Leo's hostile attitude towards his

66. See the Index fontium in *Leonis VI Homiliae* (quoted n. 14), pp. 667–8.

67. For the poem, see W. CHRIST & M. PARANIKAS, *Anthologia Graeca carminum Christianorum*, Leipzig 1871; repr. Hildesheim 1963, p. xli; cf. p. li on Leo.

68. For Leo's hymnographic work see the useful preliminary study in A. E. ΑΛΥΓΙΖΑΚΗΣ [A. E. ALYGIZAKIS], 'Η βασιλική Ύμνογραφία : σ' -ι' αι., in *Xριστιανική Θεσσαλονίκη : ἀπό τῆς Ιουστινιανέιου ἐποχῆς ἕως καὶ τῆς Μακεδονικῆς δυναστείας, ΚΔ' Δημήτρια, Γ' Ἐπιστημονικό Συμπόσιο* (Κέντρο Ιστορίας Θεσσαλονίκης τοῦ Δήμου Θεσσαλονίκης. Αύτοτελεῖς ἐκδόσεις 6), Θεσσαλονίκη 1991, pp. 185–261, esp. 205–16 with the Tables on pp. 227–32, 235–46, and 251, listing 111 *idiomela* and 39 *stavrotheotokia* plus some other hymns attributed to the emperor. Cf. the remarks on the manuscript tradition of the hymns in ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), p. 20 n. 97, pp. 46–7; also below, n. 71. Its study remains an urgent research *desideratum*. Cf. below, p. 232.

69. On the suggestion that music was part of Leo's education, see VOGT, *Jeunesse* (quoted n. 4), p. 407. The teaching of music and the rest of the *quadrivium* was restricted to an intellectual elite; see A. TIHON, Numeracy and science, in *The Oxford handbook of Byzantine studies*, ed. by E. Jeffreys with J. Haldon and R. Cormack, Oxford 2008, pp. 803–19, esp. 809–10.

70. Below, pp. 210–2.

71. See the edition of this and a further three hymns in T. DETORAKIS, 'Ἄγνωστοι ὄμνοι Λέοντος Σ' τοῦ Σοφοῦ', in *Myriobiblos : essays on Byzantine literature and culture*, ed. by T. Antonopoulou, S. Kotzabassi and M. Loukaki (Byzantinisches Archiv 29), Berlin – New York 2015, pp. 131–41, esp. 135–41. Detorakis also gives a listing of Leo's hymns contained in the liturgical books of *Parakletike*, *Triodion*, *Pentecostarion* and the *Menaea*.

former teacher, Photios emerges as Leo's literary and theological model, his oratorical and theological work affecting the emperor's own. Even if we assume for a moment that Photios had not been Leo's tutor in the strict sense of the word, Leo did indeed learn from the patriarch's work and example.⁷²

With regard to verbatim quotations, one may begin by mentioning the *incipit* of *Homily 3* (l. 4), which is the same as the *incipit* of Photios' *Homily 12*, as well as certain addresses to the audience, which are taken over from Photios' homilies.⁷³ Regarding the latter it is both ironic and revealing from a psychological point of view that Leo employs his teacher's verbal example in a homily (no. 22) which celebrates the installation of the new patriarch, the emperor's brother Stephen, in place of the deposed Photios, whose words would probably still echo with the audience. Other expressions may have been taken over from Photios, although this remains uncertain (for example, *Hom.* 21, 179–80; 182–3, which may derive from the *Bibliotheca*, or the passage from the rhetor Demades, pointed out above, which could have been drawn from Photios' *Lexicon*). Also most noteworthy is a passage in the description of the Church of the Holy Apostles (*Hom.* 41, 267–70), which is heavily influenced by Photios' description of the Church of the Virgin of the Pharos in his *Homily 10*.⁷⁴ The very inclusion of church ecphrases in three of Leo's sermons (nos. 31, 37 and 41) can be traced back, though not exclusively, to that homily of Photios. The patriarch's influence was also commented upon above with regard to Leo's employment of mythological *exempla*. Furthermore, on one occasion (*Hom.* 14, 126–9), the emperor seems to refer to a lost work, where Photios had fabricated Basil I's royal ancestry, a work which is known from Nicetas David's *Life of Ignatios* and the chronicle of Pseudo-Symeon. The supposed ancestry was adopted by both Basil and Leo, and later by Constantine VII.⁷⁵

The most impressive case, however, of Leo's usage of his former teacher's works is the *Homily on the feast of the Holy Spirit*, destined for the Monday after Pentecost (*Hom.* 7), where he adopts Photios' staunch stance against the *filioque*. Apart from a passage on the Holy Spirit (ll. 158–60) which recalls a passage from Photios' epistle to Boris-Michael (*Ep.* 1), a considerable part of this homily (ll. 253–324) draws extensively on Photios' encyclical letter to the Eastern Patriarchates (*Ep.* 2) and, at the same time, on his treatise *On the mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*.⁷⁶ This parallel usage in the form of quotations and

72. See a first account of Photios' literary influence on Leo on the testimony of the *Homilies*, in ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 272–4.

73. See *Hom.* 22, 34–5 (ὦ πατρικὴ πολιά) and similar at 50–1, 85–6; *Hom.* 29, 153 (ὦ πολιὰ πατρικὴ καὶ αἰδέσμος).

74. On the art-historical importance of this *ecphrasis* for our knowledge of the architecture and, especially, the mosaic decoration of the Holy Apostles, see L. JAMES & I. GAVRIL, A homily with a description of the Church of the Holy Apostles, *Byz.* 83, 2013, pp. 149–60.

75. See the *app. font.* to *Hom.* 14, 126–9, *Leonis VI Homiliae* (quoted n. 14), p. 199. On the genealogy concocted by Photios, see *Vita Ignatii*, § 89, p. 118,27–30; Ps.-Symeon, § 7, ed. in Theophanes continuatus, p. 689,7–8. Cf. recently, A. MARKOPOULOS [A. MARKOPOULOS], Οι μεταμορφώσεις της “μυθολογίας” του Βασιλείου Α', in *Αντικήνωστρο : τιμητικός τόμος Σπύρου Ν. Τρωιάνου γιὰ τὰ ὄγδοηκοστά γενέθλιά του, συντακτική ἐπιτροπὴ Β. Λεονταρίτου*, K. A. Μπουρδάρα, E. S. Παπαγάννη, Αθῆνα 2013, pp. 945–70, esp. 954–7, 960–3 with bibliography; also below, p. 230 with n. 210.

76. Photios also dealt with the *filioque* in his letter 291 to the archbishop of Aquileia, dated to 883/884; although he could have used it, Leo does not quote it.

adaptations is proved by those passages that occur in only one of the two works, as noted in detail in the *apparatus fontium* to the edition of Leo's homily. Whereas, however, the relevant part of the encyclical letter dates from 867, thus posing no problem for its citation by Leo, quoting the *Mystagogy* entails a chronological puzzle. Most probably, Photios composed or completed this work after 886, that is after his second deposition in the autumn of that year, since in it he attacks an unnamed pope, most probably Stephen V (885–91), who in 885 had confirmed the *filioque*.⁷⁷ Regarding the circumstances of Photios' deposition, it may be recalled that despite the support Photios had lent Leo, then heir to the throne, against an accusation of conspiracy to murder Basil I, Leo seems to have been suspicious of the patriarch's role in his own temporary removal from power in 883. He was thus quick to have Photios deposed when he became emperor, and also to have him stand trial in 887. Photios was confined to a monastery at Hieria near Constantinople, although sometime before his demise he must have been at least partially rehabilitated.⁷⁸ The date of Photios' demise is unknown, but it was placed after 893 by Romilly Jenkins, a date generally accepted but not properly argued.⁷⁹ Leo, who definitely used that work in its final recension,⁸⁰ undoubtedly had access to it after it was completed. It should, however, be ruled out that he quoted a living person's work extensively, especially that of Photios in the dire situation just described—unless the former patriarch gave Leo access to it, for example with a view to appeasing him—, therefore Photios must have been deceased by that time. The date of *Homily 7* is unknown, but for a number of reasons I have suggested 892 and 899 as plausible alternatives, with a preference for the former year, given that the work seems to date from early in the reign due to a possible reference to Leo's problems with his father.⁸¹ More recently, Henry Chadwick has speculated that Leo's attack on the *filioque* was meant to reassure eventual critics that he was not obsequious to the papacy, when in 899 the council that confirmed Photios'

77. On the works of Photios in question and their dating, see H. CHADWICK, *East and West : the making of a rift in the church : from apostolic times until the Council of Florence* (Oxford history of the Christian church), Oxford – New York 2003, pp. 154–7, 182–8. The authorship of *Ep. 2* and the *Mystagogy* were questioned by T. M. KOLBABA, *Inventing Latin heretics : Byzantines and the Filioque in the ninth century*, Kalamazoo MI 2008, pp. 57–75 and 76–103 respectively (without knowledge of their use in Leo's *Hom. 7*, the critical edition of which came out the same year as her book). The authorship of the *Mystagogy* has been reaffirmed by V. POLIDORI, Photios and Metrophanes of Smyrna : the controversy of the authorship of the *Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*, MEG 14, 2014, pp. 199–208; see also, Id., Towards a critical edition of Photios' *Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*, *Studi sull'Oriente cristiano* 19, 2015, pp. 5–18 with a discussion of the dating (to not much later than the end of 884), which, however, makes no reference to Chadwick's contribution.

78. On these events, see TOUGHER, *The reign of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 68–88 (chap. III: The end of Photios).

79. R. J. H. JENKINS, A note on Nicetas David Paphlago and the *Vita Ignatii*, DOP 19, 1965, pp. 241–7, esp. 244; repr. in Id., *Studies on Byzantine history of the 9th and 10th centuries*, London 1970, no. IX. Cf. TOUGHER, *The reign of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), p. 86.

80. Following KOLBABA, *Inventing Latin heretics* (quoted n. 77), Polidori accepts that the *Mystagogy* is a composite work; see POLIDORI, Towards a critical edition (quoted n. 77), p. 7 with n. 12. However, such a nature of the *Mystagogy* does not negatively affect the argumentation presented here, since Leo does not draw on a single part of his source, but on various possibly “constituent” parts, which presupposes access to the final version of the work.

81. For the argumentation, see ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 54–6.

expulsion was attended by Roman legates.⁸² Although neither date can be proved, the later one allows more time for Leo to gain access to the *Mystagogy* after Photios’ death.

III. FROM LEO’S WORK: HAGIOGRAPHICAL METAPHRASES, OTHER REWRITINGS AND REWORKINGS, AND THE NEED FOR RENOVATION

The question that vexes much of Byzantine literature, that is whether and to what extent individual works can be perceived as literary in the modern sense, also applies to Leo. His work as a whole was neither literary in a strict sense nor destined primarily to please the audience, but was defined by religion and practical usefulness. Nevertheless, his rhetorical and poetic oeuvre in particular has unquestionable qualities which allow us to view it as (broadly) literary. To some extent, such qualities are discernible even in his *Newels*. In the following, however, I will focus on one issue, that Leo was at the heart of an important development of the ninth and tenth centuries, that of hagiographical *metaphrasis* or rewriting. As is well known, the literary development in question entailed the composition of hagiographical texts which were based on previous ones, but on a higher linguistic register. The work of Symeon Metaphrastes, towards the end of the tenth century, is the culmination of this trend,⁸³ which had been in vogue since the early ninth century and led to the disappearance of a number of earlier works that no longer corresponded to the new literary taste. A lot of scholarship has been produced on the subject and much remains to be done for the following centuries.⁸⁴

Leo’s hagiographical *Homilies* are original works, yet most of them were based on identifiable models, which, incidentally, have been preserved. The author even kept their structure and quoted certain of their expressions. For these reasons, the homilies in question can be considered as rewritings of the previous works. This is actually the way these homilies were perceived in later Byzantium; Nicephorus Gregoras, who praises Leo’s hagiographical activity, specifically describes it as metaphrastic.⁸⁵ The rewriting took on various forms.⁸⁶ The poem on the passion of St. Clement of Ancyra (*Hom.* 26) consists of

82. CHADWICK, *East and West* (quoted n. 77), p. 183.

83. See recently B. FLUSIN, Vers la métaphrase, in *Remanier, métaphraser : fonctions et techniques de la réécriture dans le monde byzantin*, éd. par S. Marjanović-Dušanić & B. Flusin, Belgrade 2011, pp. 85–99; C. HØGEL, Symeon Metaphrastes and the Metaphrastic movement, in *The Ashgate research companion to Byzantine hagiography*. 2 (quoted n. 13), pp. 181–96 with previous literature and a passing mention of Leo VI among predecessors of Symeon on p. 185.

84. See, for example, the case of the works of Merkourios the Grammarian, a poet of probably the early fourteenth century; *Mercurii Grammatici Opera iambica*, ed. T. Antonopoulou (CCSG 87), Turnhout 2017; see especially pp. xxxix–xlII, on the issue of rewriting.

85. See Gregoras’ *Life of Theophano*, ed. E. KURTZ, Zwei griechische Texte über die heilige Theophano, *Mémoires de l’Académie impériale des sciences de St-Pétersbourg* 8. série 3, 2, 1898, pp. 25–45, esp. 40,32–3: ὁν (sc. τὸν τότε ἐλλογίμων) εἰς ἦν καὶ βελτίων, ὃς τά τε ὄλλα μετέφρασε πρὸς τὸ εὐφραδέστερον καὶ τοὺς πλείους τῶν τε τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀσκητῶν καὶ ἀθλητῶν συνεγράψατο βίους.

86. On the various kinds of rewriting, see P. BOUET & F. KERLOUÉGAN, La réécriture dans le latin du haut Moyen Âge, *Lalies : actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature* 8, 1986, pp. 153–68. On Byzantine rewritings, see in particular the articles in *Remanier, métaphraser* (quoted n. 83); J. SIGNES CODONÉR, Towards a vocabulary for rewriting in Byzantium, in *Textual transmission in Byzantium : between textual criticism and Quellenforschung*, ed. by J. Signes Codonér & I. Pérez Martín (Lectio : studies in the transmission of texts and ideas 2), Turnhout 2014, pp. 61–90; Σ. Α. ΠΑΣΧΑΛΙΔΗΣ

the rewriting in verse of a surviving, though still unpublished prose model (*BHG* 352).⁸⁷ The homilies on St. Demetrios (no. 17), St. Nicholas (no. 21), St. Trypho (no. 27) and St. John Chrysostom (no. 38) have prose models, which were transformed in terms of genre: as mentioned above, the models were hagiographical Lives and Passions, that is, the *Vita* of Nicholas by Michael (*BHG* 1348), two anonymous *Passiones* (*BHG* 497 of Demetrios and 1856 of Trypho) and the *Vita* of John Chrysostom by George of Alexandria (*CPG* 7979), which were all rewritten by Leo as homilies. The *Homily on the translation of Chrysostom* (no. 41) elaborated the story as narrated by Cosmas Vestitor in one of his orations on the topic (*CPG* 8145), as well as adding the *ecephrasis* of the Church of the Holy Apostles noted above. Apart from form and genre, in all cases the rewriting involved a higher linguistic register and a more abstract, rhetorical style. This way of working is in keeping with Leo's clear preference for purely rhetorical sermons, which represent a culminating point in the rhetorical tradition of homiletics while announcing similar developments in tenth-century homiletics.⁸⁸

Taking the above into consideration, it becomes obvious that Leo is another link in the chain of *metaphrasis*, preceding Nicetas David the Paphlagonian, who is a younger contemporary and more widely known in this respect.⁸⁹ Moreover, while Nicetas appears to have conceived the idea of a full cycle of encomia on the Apostles, Evangelists and saints of apostolic times, also including a few other saints and feasts along the way,⁹⁰ Leo had already created an original collection to cover the homiletic needs of the full liturgical cycle of major movable and immovable feasts in festal order. To this purpose, he availed himself of his own sermons on the major feasts of the Lord and the Theotokos, as well as of those on certain saints to whom he was personally devoted. He also applied certain personal criteria in incorporating in the collections a few homilies on special occasions. His homilies on subjects other than on the saints mentioned above are not

[S. A. PASHALIDIS], Παρατηρήσεις στὶς μεταφράσεις τῶν βυζαντινῶν ἀγιολογικῶν κειμένων, *Byzantina* 33, 2013–2014, pp. 373–86.

87. The edition is in progress by the present author; see T. ANTONOPOULOU, The ancient Passion of St. Clement of Ancyra : preliminary remarks on the planned first edition, in *The arts of editing medieval Greek and Latin : a casebook*, ed. by E. Göransson *et al.* (Pontifical Institute of medieval studies, Studies and texts 203), Toronto 2016, pp. 22–33.

88. See ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 257–9.

89. See Σ. Α. ΠΑΣΧΑΛΙΔΗΣ [S. A. PASHALIDIS], *Νικήτας Δαβίδ Παφλαγών : τό πρόσωπο καὶ τὸ ἔργο του* (Βυζαντινά κείμενα και μελέται 28), Θεσσαλονίκη 1999, pp. 305–7, esp. on Nicetas' own statements on his metaphrastic principles; also, *ibid.*, pp. 123–222 for references to the sources of individual hagiographical works (I do not include in his works nos. 29–30, on which see ANTONOPOULOU, *Leonis VI Homiliae* [quoted n. 14], pp. ccxii–ccxvi); FLUSIN, Vers la métaphrase (quoted n. 83), pp. 92–7. On the dating of his sermons, see L. G. WESTERINK, Nicetas the Paphlagonian on the end of the world, in *Mελετήματα στὴ μνήμην Βασιλείου Λαούρδα*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1975, pp. 177–95, esp. 182–3, suggesting that he may have started composing his *menologion* during his two-year isolation at the Agathos Monastery during the course of the quarrel over Leo's tetragamy; on the dating of the *Passion of St George* before he fell out with Arethas, see FLUSIN, Vers la métaphrase, p. 98. Nicetas practised asceticism, but did not take the habit until perhaps later in his life. The problem of his dating was posed again recently by TREADGOLD, *The middle Byzantine historians* (quoted n. 19), pp. 139–46, who suggests that he was a slightly older contemporary of Leo.

90. On Nicetas' *Special panegyric*, which survives in two forms of different extent, see PASHALIDIS, *Νικήτας Δαβίδ Παφλαγών* (quoted n. 89), pp. 300–5.

rewritings of specific models, but are inspired by previous homiletic works and make use of their themes.⁹¹ Leo's collection of homilies, together with those by Nicetas David, are close precursors of the *Metaphrastic menologion* for the liturgical year, which, like Nicetas', focused on saints. Moreover, both collections are an integral part of the process of formation of homiletic-hagiographical collections in accordance with the ecclesiastical year, clearly attested from the beginning of the ninth century onwards. It is worth noting that still in Leo's times, Clement of Achris (Ochrid), who was well acquainted with the Greek ecclesiastical tradition, is said in the *Vita* by Theophylact of Achris to have also composed sermons for all the feasts. According to the author, these were written in language simple enough to be understood by even simple-minded Bulgarians.⁹²

Not only was Leo at the literary forefront of his time in terms of what has just been described, but he went on to experiment in other genres too. With regard to his military handbooks, the connoisseur of strategic literature Alphonse Dain noted, concerning the period from Leo VI to Nicephorus Phokas, that “after a long stagnation, activity resumes. Evidently, we are in the reign of adaptation and paraphrase.”⁹³ Leo's works may now be included under the modern heading of rewriting. In particular, the early work known as *Problemata* is the presentation of Maurice's *Strategicon* in question-and-answer form (*erotapokriseis*), a unique choice in tactical literature.⁹⁴ This form, which was usually connected to theological literature, was popular in medieval times.⁹⁵ The author preserved Maurice's division in twelve books, however. While the *Problemata* was a clear rewriting of a preceding work in different form, it would not be too far fetched to also include under the same heading the *Tactica*, which is largely based on the same *Strategicon*. This time, Leo kept the form, whereas in rewriting its contents, he intervened in it substantially. He reorganised the available material into twenty constitutions (Διατάξεις plus a preface and an epilogue), suppressed what was obsolete and no longer corresponding to contemporary reality, included other sources, and added a long treatment of the Arabs, since he also aimed at adapting precious previous knowledge to the new enemy.⁹⁶ Moreover, Constitution XIX is an original work on naval warfare, a

91. See for details, ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 116–260 (Part II, chaps. 2–6); above, p. 201 with nn. 64–5.

92. On the ninth-century panegyric and menologic collections, see the overview in PASHALIDIS, *Νικήτας Δαβίδ Παψλαγών* (quoted n. 89), pp. 297–300, esp. 299–300 with n. 10 for the *Life of Clement* (BHG 355). The most easily accessible edition of the latter remains PG 126, cols. 1193–1249; see esp. § 22, col. 1229A-C. On the historical importance of Clement's homiletic activity, see SHEPARD, *The ruler as instructor* (quoted n. 21), p. 349.

93. See A. DAIN (texte mis au net et complété par J.-A. de FOUCault), *Les stratégistes byzantins*, TM 2, 1967, pp. 317–92, esp. 353.

94. *Leonis VI Sapientis Problemata*, nunc primum ed., adnotatione critica et indice auxit A. Dain, Paris 1935. Cf. DAIN & FOUCALT, *Les stratégistes byzantins* (quoted n. 93), p. 354.

95. On this form, see recently P. ERMILOV, Towards a classification of sources in Byzantine question-and-answer literature, in *Theologica minora : the minor genres of Byzantine theological literature*, ed. by A. Rigo in collab. with P. Ermilov & M. Trizio (Byzantios 8), Turnhout 2013, pp. 110–25 (with further bibliography), esp. 120–3 for the transposition of various works, mainly of biblical exegesis, into question-and-answer form.

96. Constitution XVIII, §§ 109–42; see especially G. DAGRON, *Byzance et le modèle islamique, à propos des Constitutions tactiques de l'empereur Léon VI*, CRAI 1983, pp. 219–32; Id., *Ceux d'en face : les peuples étrangers dans les traités militaires byzantins*, TM 10, 1987, pp. 207–32, esp. 216–24.

subject absent from earlier handbooks, which shows Leo's concern for making his work a practical handbook useful to his armies.⁹⁷ Therefore, it can be suggested that the two successive rewritings had distinct purposes: with the *Problemata* Leo familiarised himself and his audience with the *Strategicon* and the rationale of a strategic treatise, while with the *Tactica*, written in the second half of the reign, he produced not just an updated version of Maurice but also a highly individual work. In the latter case, he performed a process comparable to the treatment by both Basil I and Leo of the older, Justinianic legislation, which led to the codification first of the *Forty books*, and then of the *Sixty books*, the celebrated *Basilica*. As is well known, the concern of the first two Macedonian emperors was the ἀνακάθαρσις τῶν παλαιῶν νόμων, the “cleansing of the old laws,” to which Leo himself refers.⁹⁸ Similarly, from the prooimion to the *Tactica* it emerges, even though not stated in the same words and despite the dependence on Maurice, that his aim was the *anakatharsis* of the old *strategica* in order to make them useful for a new era. Significantly, the linguistic dimension of the rewriting of the ancient material is presented in detail by the author, whose target, following Maurice, was clarity and easy comprehension (σαφήνειο λόγου and σαφῆς κατάληψις).⁹⁹

Coming to the *Guidance*, an unusual and intriguing case of rewriting presents itself, since Leo can be said to have rewritten his own work. The *Guidance* presents a novel mixture of literary genres, as it combines the ascetic treatise with chapter collection (a popular monastic literary genre, which permitted aphoristic statements in lieu of long expositions),¹⁰⁰ prescriptive monastic rules, and exegesis. On the evidence of the preface, Leo addresses an unnamed abbot, who was most probably his spiritual father Euthymios. At his instigation, in the years between roughly 890 and 907, Leo writes down the thoughts which he appears to have formulated during their conversations, and provides guidance for the monks of Euthymios' monastic community. The thoughts are initially couched in obscure Greek (ἡ τῆς ἐννοίας πρὸς τὸ δυσεύρετον ἀναχώρησις), which

On the character of the *Tactica*, see the Introduction in HALDON, *A critical commentary* (quoted n. 14), pp. 15–55, and, among previous literature, especially DAIN & FOUCault, *Les stratégités byzantins* (quoted n. 93), pp. 353–67; P. MAGDALINO, The non-juridical legislation of the emperor Leo VI, in *Analecta Atheniensia ad ius Byzantium spectantia. I*, hrsg. von S. N. Troianos (Forschungen zur byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte. Athener Reihe 10), Athen 1997, pp. 169–82, esp. 174–82.

97. There is rich literature on Constitution XIX; see recently C. ZUCKERMAN, On the Byzantine dromon (with a special regard to *De cerim.* II, 44–45), *REB* 73, 2015, pp. 57–98, esp. 81–2, underlining Leo's tactical innovations with regard to the *dromon* and their application to the Syrian campaign of 910.

98. For ἡ τῶν νόμων ἀνακάθαρσις see, for example, Leo's *Novel* 94. On the significance of this term, see P. PIELER, Ἀνακάθαρσις τῶν παλαιῶν νόμων und makedonische Renaissance, *Subseciva Groningana* 3, 1989, pp. 61–77; also Σ. Ν. ΤΡΟΙΑΝΟΣ [S. N. TROIANOS], *Oι πηγές των βυζαντινού δικαίου*, Αθήνα 2011³, pp. 213–6. On the *Basilica*, see also below, p. 225 with nn. 179–80; cf. also n. 139.

99. See §§ 5–6, ll. 37–78, pp. 4–8, esp. ll. 67 and 71 for the phrases noted here respectively (in the former case, see the app. cr. for the alternative manuscript reading which speaks of brevity, as in Maurice, and easy reading); cf. the preface to Maurice's *Strategicon*, pp. 68–70, ll. 10–35, esp. p. 70, 29–31, *Das Strategikon des Maurikios*, Einf., Ed. und Indices von G. T. Dennis, Übers. von E. Gamillscheg (CFHB 17), Wien 1981.

100. On chapters in general, see P. GÉHIN, Les collections de *kephalaia* monastiques : naissance et succès d'un genre entre création originale, plagiat et florilège, in *Theologica minora* (quoted n. 95), pp. 1–50 (with no reference to Leo VI); also, P. VAN DEUN, Exploration du genre byzantin des *kephalaia* : la collection attribuée à Théognoste, *ibid.*, pp. 51–66.

would have been difficult for most to understand. As a result, the author feels obliged to render his instructions into an easily comprehensible language. To this purpose, each of the 190 chapters is accompanied by an explanation (τῆς ἐκ τῶν προσπαρακειμένων ἔξηγήσεως σχολίων ἀταλαίπωρον τὴν λῆψιν χαριζομένης); the first chapter even has an alternative explanation (introduced by ή ἄλλως).¹⁰¹ Nevertheless, as noted above, a specific source of inspiration must also have existed behind such an odd choice, namely the *Ladder* of John Climacus. This prescriptive text, which, in addition, gave Leo the idea of a symbolic structure of his work, was unintelligible enough to invite commentaries, including circumstantial scholia like his own.¹⁰² Moreover, it can easily be envisaged that a secular person like Leo, perhaps still relatively young, would have hardly been in a position, albeit emperor, to give advice to monks, if this had not been dressed in the appropriately obscure language which dignified his words and testified to his ascent to spiritual heights, comparable to those of the author of the *Ladder*. He thus formulated his instructions accordingly and then took his role as a spiritual guide a step further, being transformed into an exegete of himself, rewriting his own text in the process, and making the rewriting an integral part of the work. Leo did not compete with the *Ladder* nor did he try to substitute it; rather, he wished to offer monks a supplementary concise compendium of spiritual life and proper conduct. However, as Vincent Deroche has noted, this monastic “rule” combined with the *Vita Euthymii* is a testimony to “the proximity, real or wished for, between the monks and the imperial power” rather than to everyday life in Euthymios’ monastery.¹⁰³ It can be added that it is an exploration of novel literary ways that stretch the limits of traditional genres.

It is also worth turning our attention to some of Leo’s poetic works that present a related literary problem, connected as they are by a common theme, which is the Second Coming and the Last Judgment. Although the poems are not rewritings of a previous text, they present reworkings of the central subject in a variety of ways.

The first poem is the *Odarion katanyktikon* or *Song of compunction*. This is in “anacreontic” form, which enjoyed a certain vogue in the poetry of the ninth and tenth centuries after a period of silence. Leo himself is credited with other “anacreontic” poems of profane character, which do not survive.¹⁰⁴ The poem consists of 188 octosyllables arranged in 30 stanzas of six verses each plus a final stanza of eight verses. It has an alphabetic acrostic, which connects twenty-four of its stanzas, while an extra stanza occurs every four alphabetic stanzas and repeats the preceding letter. These extra stanzas, six

101. See the edition of the preface of the Greek text in GROS DIDIER DE MATONS, *Trois études* (quoted n. 30), pp. 213–4.

102. For the *Ladder* as a multilevel model of the *Guidance*, see ANTONOPOULOU, Unpublished scholia (quoted n. 32), p. 32; above, p. 194.

103. See V. DÉROCHE, *La vie des moines : les sources pour l’Asie Mineure et les Balkans, ca 300–1000 apr. J.-C.*, in *La vie quotidienne des moines en Orient et en Occident (IV^e–X^e siècle). I, L’état des sources*, éd. par O. Delouis & M. Mossakowska-Gaubert (IFAO, Bibliothèque d’étude 163), Le Caire – Athènes 2015, pp. 275–87, esp. 282.

104. On “anacreontics” in this period, see P. MAGDALINO, *The bath of Leo the Wise and the “Macedonian Renaissance” revisited : topography, iconography, ceremonial, ideology*, *DOP* 42, 1988, pp. 97–118, esp. 98; M. D. LAUXTERMANN, *The spring of rhythm : an essay on the political verse and other Byzantine metres* (*Byzantina Vindobonensia* 22), Wien 1999, pp. 43–5. On Leo’s lost “anacreontic” poems, see ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), p. 21 with bibliography.

altogether, function as *kukulia* and are dedicated to Christ or the Theotokos, reminding one of the *theotokia* of the canons. The final, thirty-first stanza also addresses the Theotokos. According to the indications of the manuscripts, the poem was actually sung to a preexisting *hirmos*. In this sense, this sample of personal religious poetry may be considered as another facet of Leo's hymnography. This impression is reinforced by the fact that in it Leo adopts unprosodic accentual metrics. As for the subject of the *Song*, it develops the theme of the Second Coming and the Last Judgment. The poet starts by envisaging Hell, then addresses his soul, reminding it of the Coming of the Lord in His glory to judge it and the whole earth. The description of the Last Judgment follows. The poet laments for his sins throughout the poem, calls his soul to vigilance and repentance, and prays for his salvation.¹⁰⁵

Next come two poems, one long (45 vv.), the other short (7 vv.), which deal with the same topic of the Second Coming but in a completely different way in comparison to the *Odarion*. They are cast in dodecasyllables and employ the lily as a metaphor for the Last Judgment, when the Apostles, seated around Christ, will judge the humanity. As their editor Silvio Giuseppe Mercati pertinently pointed out, the metaphor is based on the wordplay κρίνον (lily) – κρίνω (judge); moreover, the correct observation of the physical appearance of the flower is at the base of the poetic (and perhaps artistic) image which is central to both poems, and shows Christ in the epicentre of two circles of six apostles each.¹⁰⁶

Third, a *Paraclete canon to Jesus Christ* focusing on divine economy and the Last Judgment was edited under Leo's name, for the first time as recently as 1991.¹⁰⁷ To my knowledge, it has never been dealt with since in scholarly literature, which makes it necessary to comment here on certain aspects of it. The work is preserved in three manuscripts, of which the oldest, the Grottaferrata codex Δ.γ.X, is of the twelfth century, the second is dated to 1481 and the third is of the eighteenth century. The canon is anonymous in the oldest codex and is attributed to the "despot Leo" in the other two. The editor, Antonios Alygizakis, accepted the authorship of the canon, albeit admitting that no solid arguments can be produced in favour of its authenticity. The earliest manuscript provides the *terminus ante quem* for its composition as well as a testimony that the canon was included in the early versions of the liturgical book of the *Parakletike*—an expansion of the *Oktoechos*—, of which this codex is a representative. The editor, who also furnished a musical transcription and performed the canon in public, assured of the exceptional

105. For the critical edition of the *Odarion*, following a number of previous editions, see F. CICCOLELLA, Il carme anacreontico di Leone VI, *Bollettino dei classici*, ser. 3, 10, 1989, pp. 17–37, who also offers a metrical study of the poem with previous literature; cf. also LAUXTERMANN, *The spring of rhythm* (quoted n. 104), p. 43; F. CICCOLELLA, *Cinque poeti bizantini : anacreontee dal Barberiniano greco 310* (*Hellenica* 5), Alessandria 2000, p. LIII. Eight more manuscripts of the *Song of compunction* have in the meantime been listed in the Pinakes database; see <http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/oeuvre/id/983>. On the work within its genre, see recently A. GIANNOULI, *Catanyctic religious poetry : a survey*, in *Theologica minora* (quoted n. 95), pp. 86–109, esp. 91–2, 107.

106. See the edition and study of S. G. MERCATI, Il simbolo del giglio in una poesia di Leone il Sapiente, *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia di archeologia*, Roma 12, 1936, pp. 65–73 with the texts on 72–3; repr. in ID., *Collectanea Byzantina*, 2, Bari 1970, pp. 490–8.

107. Α. Ε. ΑΛΥΓΙΖΑΚΗΣ [Α. E. ALYGIZAKIS], Λέοντος τοῦ Σοφοῦ ἀνέκδοτος παρακλητικός κανόνας στό Δεσπότη Χριστό, Θεσσαλονίκη 1991, pp. 31–43.

competence of the hymnographer with regard to canon form and music.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, he stressed the unusual realism of the canon and its graphic references to carnal sins.¹⁰⁹

Indeed, this is a striking feature of the text. The hymnographer not only insists on the struggle inside himself and pleads repeatedly for the forgiveness of his sins, as is to be expected from this kind of canon, but he also specifically and explicitly refers to sexual misconduct. If the editor were right in suspecting a connection of this theme to the misfortunes of Leo’s marriages,¹¹⁰ this would probably date the canon to his quarrel with the church over his fourth marriage and his ensuing excommunication in (probably April) 906, due to which Leo would be asking for forgiveness. Such a personal tone is not inconceivable for a liturgical text. It would also fit Leo’s personality and personal history well. In his *Homily* 34, delivered in July 886, he had expressed remorse for his wrongful conduct towards his father, while it is known that he repented for his fourth marriage. In connection with the latter story, the *Vita Euthymii* even presents him as shedding tears in public, which were carefully orchestrated with the purpose to gain him the sympathy of the audience, on two occasions.¹¹¹ Nonetheless, a close look at the canon’s passages on sexual sins reveals an aspect that has as yet escaped attention, that is a focus on homosexual conduct. Starting with more general references—for example, to the Sodomites at ode 1 trop. 3, and to fornication at ode 6 trop. 1—, the poet goes on to specify in three troparia, one in each of the last three odes, that he is particularly concerned with the Sodomites—who are mentioned three times in total—with “fornication between males,” the “departures from natural intercourse,” and the intercourse “*contra naturam*.” He prays that he may not imitate such behaviour, warns that those who pursue same-sex relations will be condemned in eternity, and asks that his soul beware through repentance not to commit that sin.¹¹² If the poem had a personal character, these references would scarcely concern Leo, who repeatedly reiterated his idea of marriage and its only alternative, celibacy (e.g. in *Novel* 98 forbidding the marriages of eunuchs, while disavowing the practice of castration). It is possible, however, that the canon contains no personal references, the hymnographer speaking instead on behalf of the sinful human being, who is his literary mask, and referring to behaviours that have to be avoided. Concerns about sexual misconduct and daring language are familiar from other catanyctic texts,¹¹³ but their explicit character in this canon is particularly in line with other of Leo’s works. In fact, in *Homily* 33 he provides a realistic description by which, despite his own and his audience’s feeling of shame, he is obliged to attribute the

108. *Ibid.*, pp. 17–21, 24.

109. *Ibid.*, p. 24.

110. *Ibid.*, p. 21.

111. For the references see below, n. 118.

112. See ode 6 trop. 1 ἡ ήδονὴ τῆς σαρκός, | παρονόμοις μίξει; ode 7 trop. 3 Σοδόμοις ἀπώλειαιν | ἐπιμέξιά ἀρρένων ἔνεγκεν | ... | φεῦγε, ψυχή μου, | τὴν ἄθεσμον μύμησον; ode 8 trop. 2 Αἱ ήδοναι τοῦ σώματος | καὶ κινήσεις αἱ ἄτακτοι | καὶ παραλλαγαὶ τῆς φυσικῆς ἐνώσεως | ἀθλίως τελούμεναι | τῷ ἀκοιμήτῳ σκάληκι | πέμπουσιν τοὺς ταῦτα | ἐπιμένοντας πάντας | καὶ μὴ μετανοοῦντας; | τί ποιήσω ὁ ἄφρων, | τί γένωμαι ὁ τάλας; οἰκτείρησόν με, Λόγε; and ode 9 trop. 1 Μακρόθυμον τὸν φύσει καὶ ἀγαθόν, | παρὰ φύσιν δεινῶς ἀσελγαίνοντες | νιοὶ λοιμῶν, | πάλαι Σοδομῖται εἰς προφανῆ | κινοῦσιν ἀγανάκτησιν, | ὅλεθρον δεξάμενοι παντελῆ! | ψυχὴ ἀθλία, ὄρα | καὶ πρόσεχε καὶ φρίξον | καὶ μετανοίᾳ βελτιώθητι.

113. See the parallels from the *Parakletike* and the *Great canon* of Andrew of Crete in ALYGIZAKIS, Λέοντος τοῦ Σοφοῦ κανόνας (quoted n. 107), pp. 81–3.

burning down of the church of St. Thomas in the first years of his reign to unnamed persons' fornicating inside it.¹¹⁴ The homily may possibly be brought into correlation with one of Leo's *Novels* (no. 73) addressed to Stylianos Zaoutzes,¹¹⁵ which condemns and forbids the cohabitation of priests as well as secular men with females inside the so-called *catechumena* of churches. In this way, the emperor demonstrates once again his concern for the desired impeccable moral standing of the church and his care to protect it from secularization.¹¹⁶ In another instance, in the *Guidance*, Leo discerns four causes of nocturnal emission (᷄ὐείρωξις), three natural and one supernatural. The latter, which is demonic influence, as well as one of the natural causes, which is involuntary and a result of physical weakness, the author considers beyond reproach. On the contrary, one should be cleansed in case of the two natural causes considered voluntary, physical strength and production of mental images, especially so in the latter case.¹¹⁷ In a more general manner, the theme of sin and the Last Judgment also preoccupied him in his *Song of compunction*. Therefore, although the only external connection of the canon to the emperor is the attribution to him in two late manuscripts—in which his name could have resulted from a number of accidents in the tradition—I would suggest that this attribution may be upheld, although with some reservation.

These four poetic compositions, the order of which cannot be conjectured, present variations of the same central topic, the Second Coming and Last Judgment, which Leo approached with three different focuses and cast in three different forms, those of the canon, the anacreontic poem and the dodecasyllable, the first two set to music. It is obvious that the subject weighed heavily on his thought when composing the works in question. Nothing of the sort can be observed in the *Homilies*, which all date from before 905. Thus, as F. Ciccolella has suggested in the case of the *Song of compunction*,¹¹⁸ and A. Alygizakis in the case of the *Paracletic canon*, even though for the wrong reasons, it is possible that the poems were indeed composed during Leo's last years, when he was troubled by the repercussions of his fourth marriage.

114. *Hom.* 33, 109–28, p. 443.

115. On the *Novels* addressed to Zaoutzes, and the varying views on their date and the meaning of the addressee's title *basile(i)opator*, see recently J. SIGNES CODOÑER, The corpus of Leo's *Novels*: some suggestions regarding their date and promulgation, *Subseciva Groningana* 8, 2009, pp. 1–33, esp. 18–27; A. GKOУTZOUKOSTAS, The dignity of *Basile(i)opator*, in FM 12, Frankfurt am Main 2014, pp. 205–33, esp. 233; A. SCHMINCK, Minima Byzantina, *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Romanistische Abteilung* 132, 2015, pp. 469–83, esp. 3, Βασιλειοπάτωρ, pp. 478–83.

116. On *Novel* 73, see BOURDARA, *H διάκριση των φύλων* (quoted n. 28), pp. 179–80.

117. Chaps. 63–4, pp. 244–5.

118. CICCOLELLA, Il carme anacreontico (quoted n. 105), pp. 28–9; against her suggestion of a connection of the *Song of compunction* with a reference in the *Vita Euthymii* 12, p. 81,31–2, which presents Leo in tears, lamenting, as if in anacreontics, in front of an audience of bishops, while holding his son Constantine in his arms, see LAUXTERMANN, *The spring of rhythm* (quoted n. 104), pp. 34–5; again, CICCOLELLA, *Cinque poeti bizantini* (quoted n. 105), p. lxxii n. 63. On Leo's shedding of tears on other occasions in connection to the tetragamy affair, as evidenced by the *Vita Euthymii*, see M. HINTERBERGER, Tränen in der byzantinischen Literatur : ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Emotionen, *JÖB* 56, 2006, pp. 27–51, esp. 36–7; and M. GRÜNBART, Der Kaiser weint : Anmerkungen zur imperialen Inszenierung von Emotionen in Byzanz, *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 42, 2008, pp. 89–108, esp. 99–104.

In light of the preceding investigation, it emerges that rewriting and variation represented authorial *modi operandi* in order to produce original works in various genres that testify to Leo's genius. On the one hand, the application of rewriting to preexistent texts in various ways, especially on the levels of language and genre, resulted in hagiographical homilies, the *Problemata*, the *Guidance*, where he applied rewriting to himself, and the *Tactica*, which is partly a rewriting, partly an up-to-date reworking. On the other hand, variation with regard to older themes and topics was central to Leo's poetry and hymnography as well as in the festal homilies. Furthermore, it may be posited that the theme of ἀνακαίνισις/ἀνακάθαρσις/*renovatio* underscores, whether explicitly or implicitly, all of his oeuvre, not only legislative¹¹⁹ but also literary in the broader sense. It is well known that the preoccupation with the renovation of the empire was central to Macedonian concerns and propaganda. In the *Funeral oration*, for example, Leo insisted on this theme as characteristic of his father's reign.¹²⁰ The same theme is implicit in the *ecphrases* of spring in *Homilies* 31 and 37.¹²¹ In this context, Leo's *Novels* provide an interesting platform of comparison with his literary works. In legislating, Leo's main concern was to make some corrections to the Justinianic provisions and fill in certain lacunae, while stressing the idea of continuity. Similarly, in his literary activity, a main preoccupation was the renewal and improvement of existing literary texts, genres and traditions, while on the whole continuity was prominent in his choices. In a most striking statement in the preface to the *Guidance*, he points out that most of the chapters contained original thoughts of his own, with only few chapters being inspired by previous thinkers, while all of them were original in form.¹²² Thus, Leo displays his intention and consciousness of opening up new ground without overthrowing tradition.

Apart from creative rewriting and variation, Leo's awareness of the need for renovation led him to employ various other literary means to achieve his target. A major means was the revitalization of long eclipsed (or recently resurfaced) literary genres, notably the *tactica*,¹²³ funeral encomia for secular persons, and *ecphrases* of churches, as well as of the inclusion of *ecphrases* of the spring in homiletics.¹²⁴ Yet another way was the composition of works that filled in voids. These included a homiletic-hagiographical *panegyricon* for the whole liturgical year, *Novels* to resolve legislative anomalies, new monastic chapters, the update of military guidance, hymnography for Matins in the new book of the *Parakletike*, and hymns to be sung in imperial and church ceremonies.¹²⁵ Moreover, he timidly allowed fiction into his works, even if undercover in the form of

119. On Leo's *anakatharsis* of law, see above, p. 208 with n. 98.

120. See, for example, P. ODORICO, La politica dell'immaginario di Leone VI il Saggio, *Byz.* 53, 1983, pp. 597–631, esp. 613–5, 624–5 on the closely related theme of καίνη καὶ εὔτακτος μεταβολή (*Hom.* 14, 314, p. 206); cf. MAGDALINO, The bath of Leo the Wise revisited (quoted n. 104), p. 105; also Id., Non-juridical legislation (quoted n. 96), for the importance of order (τάξις, εύταξία) in Leo's thought.

121. See ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 79–80.

122. See ll. 19–25, pp. 213–4 (as in n. 101, above).

123. On the renewal of this genre by Leo, see HALDON, *A critical commentary* (quoted n. 14), p. 42.

124. ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 79, 243–4, 249 with n. 58–250 with bibliography. On the *ecphrases* of spring, see recently M. LOUKAKI, *Ekphrasis earos : le topo de la venue du printemps chez des auteurs byzantins*, *Parekbolai* 3, 2013, pp. 77–106, esp. 94, 96 on Leo.

125. On the latter hymns, see below, p. 216 with n. 137.

myths used for polemical purposes. Myths together with the emphatic employment of profane classical references in such religious works *par excellence* as his homilies illustrate his focus on cultural synthesis, the combination of classical and Christian, which is characteristic of the era of the “First Byzantine humanism.” This issue will be considered again below (in Part V).

IV. LEO VI’S PERSONALITY: SOME ASPECTS

Drawing the portrait of a historical figure can make for fascinating reading, as in the classic case of Charles Diehl’s *Les figures byzantines*, where a chapter is dedicated to Leo’s four marriages.¹²⁶ Nonetheless, my intention here is not to present an accomplished portrait of Leo as a ruler, which was the purpose of Shaun Tougher’s book on the basis of the various sources of the reign, nor to offer an exhaustive study of the source material or part thereof,¹²⁷ but to sketch some aspects of Leo’s personality largely based on his own works. Such a picture will admittedly be partial, in the sense of being both incomplete and biased, yet its purpose is to shed light on the author’s self-representation, since Leo was highly sensitive to his image in the eyes of both his contemporaries and posterity. To this purpose, a few other sources will necessarily also be taken into account in order to supplement the presentation.

Leo was a Christian emperor with a sincere personal devotion to the sacred, which he expressed in a variety of ways outside literature. Such a way was the translation that he ordered of the relics of two saints that had come in contact with Jesus Christ, that is, Lazarus and Mary Magdalen.¹²⁸ His homilies and hymnography are unquestionable proof of his deep-seated religious feelings, while especially indicative of them is his catanyctic poetry. In the *Song of compunction*, the poet, who represents all sinners of this world (v. 24 τοὺς κατ’ ἐμὲ πλημμελοῦντας), repents for his sins while awaiting the Last Judgment.

His religiosity was not only overt, but perhaps also a little exaggerated for his office. Apparently, it could provoke unflattering comments among his audience, as he himself admits in an ironic statement in one of his homilies. There he presents an imaginary opponent of his reasoning that human sin had provoked the burning down of a church, an opponent who, at the instigation of the Evil One, argues that the emperor is too pious and cannot see that the fire had been caused by bad luck (*τυχηρὸν τὸ πάθος*).¹²⁹

His piety apart, the homilies testify that Leo was not very fond of theological discussions. Doctrine was necessary so far as it was the groundwork of any true believer, and, for this reason, he made an effort to include dogmatic discussions in his sermons. Following the example of Gregory of Nazianzus, the existing doctrinal discussions usually follow attacks on paganism; that is, after he has made a confident display of his knowledge of ancient religion and mythology, he feels obliged to demonstrate that he masters both Christian dogma and the history of heresies equally. Nevertheless, he does not show any

126. C. DIEHL, *Figures byzantines*. 1, Paris 1906 (1939¹²), pp. 181–215 (chap. VIII).

127. See, e.g., G. TSIAPLES, A Byzantine emperor between reality and imagination : the image of Leo VI in the hagiographical texts of the Middle Byzantine period, *Parekbolai* 4, 2014, pp. 85–110.

128. On these and other imperial transfers of relics from 843 to 1204 and their role in legitimizing imperial power, see FLUSIN, Construire une nouvelle Jérusalem (quoted n. 23), pp. 54–5, 57.

129. *Hom.* 33, 73–82; see ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 239–40.

interest in going beyond what must have already been learned during his school years, that is, the history of the main heresies of the fourth century, Arianism and Sabellianism in particular. Later heresies do not surface, neither the controversy over the Theotokos nor Monophysitism and subsequent disputes. Then, he turns to a contemporary issue, the rejection of the *filioque*, to which he dedicates almost a whole homily (no. 7 on the Holy Spirit, mentioned above), without the slightest direct reference to Photios, whose doctrine he faithfully follows. The fact that Leo was not an accomplished or original theologian, and did not purport to be one, goes hand-in-hand with his being a man not of the contemplative life, but of every-day action.

It emerges from sources other than his works that Leo loved life. He was not the one-sided bookish person that his epithet “the wise” might imply to modern-day readers. This is not just proved by his four marriages, which one might argue were partly the result of necessity, of the need to acquire a male heir to the throne. There is also the fact that as a young man he was acquainted with a young lady, Zoe Zaoutsaina, the relationship with whom, innocent though he maintained it to be, he carried on into his first marriage, causing the violent reaction of his father.¹³⁰ At a later stage, Symeon the Logothete presents Leo, still married to Theophano, as sleeping with Zoe at the time of the conspiracy to assassinate him at the monastery of Damianou (in 894/5). Moreover, he did not become the ascetic type on the way, not even after the misfortunes of his first three marriages. He entered into a relationship with his future fourth wife and empress Zoe Karbonopsina, which at the time had no realistic prospects of evolving into a legal marriage.¹³¹ Apart from these familiar marital stories, it is perhaps less well known that there was a light side to Leo’s personal life, a conviviality which, however, he combined with the assertion of his authority. The *Vita Euthymii* narrates how he acted somewhat mischievously, when he showed up at the door of Euthymios’ monastery and he drank wine with the monks. The well-informed anonymous author has no scruples in recording the episode as nothing out of order. Leo enquired about the wine, the taste of which he did not like, and seized the opportunity that presented itself to make a gift to the monastery of a vineyard that had belonged to the deceased Zoe Zaoutsaina. His spiritual father had disliked Zoe and would thus always be reminded of her.¹³² Leo’s playfulness, always together with his desire for control, is also in full display in the account of Liutprand of Cremona, which will be discussed below.

At first sight, such behaviour would come into sharp contrast with the composition of the *Guidance*, where Leo presents himself as no less than an authority on how to practise the ascetic-monastic discipline. However, his relatively relaxed attitude towards sin is also evident in it, as well as in one of his scholia and in his homilies. In the *Guidance*, in particular, as rightly pointed out by Grosdidier de Matons, his concern was to mitigate the severity of the asceticism of the monks—perhaps against the strictness of their abbot Euthymios—to underline that asceticism should take into account the individual needs of the monks, and to discern between the natural and the supernatural, or else demonic,

130. For this incident, which resulted in Basil beating Leo, see *Vita Euthymii* 7, p. 41,1–6.

131. TOUGHER, *The reign of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 133–53. For Symeon’s passage, see Symeon Magister, *Chronicon*, chap. 133, § 22, p. 278,141–51 (also under the name of Georgius Monachus in Theophanes continuatus, § 16, pp. 855,20 – 856; cf. Symeon Magister, *Chronicon*, p. 132*).

132. See *Vita Euthymii* 9, pp. 51,24 – 55,19.

causes of physical weakness. To the latter purpose, he brought into play the teachings of the medical doctors, Hippocrates in particular, even though he does not name him or any other doctor, and “rewrites” his words rather than quoting them verbatim.¹³³ Likewise, in the homilies, he naturally took care to remain within the limits of Christian ethics. Yet he explicitly advised his audience with regard to the control of carnal sin, the cleansing of the mind and the illumination of the soul to do so “to the extent that this was possible,” to quote his words.¹³⁴ This passage proves that he retained the same attitude towards himself and the others. And in his *Scholion III* on St. Paul (1 Cor. 7,5), he discusses sexual conduct within marriage in an original manner, explaining that spouses should not abstain from each other for inappropriately long periods of time.¹³⁵ One wonders whether such an attitude was a conscious effort to loosen the restraints of Christian ethics. Certainly, he did not try to abolish them, but to ease them away from extremities in both monastic asceticism and secular life. Indeed, it cannot be coincidental that he does not seem to quote ascetic literature in his homilies, which were addressed to large audiences outside of monasteries.

As far as Leo’s practical side is concerned, this becomes evident from the fact that all of his literary works, with no exception whatsoever, had a practical purpose, namely to care for the social or spiritual needs of the people and for the state. Spiritual care included the composition and delivery of the *Homilies*, which, moreover, as I have demonstrated elsewhere, were a vehicle of large-scale political propaganda, inoculating the audience with the basic principles of the imperial idea. Homiletics in general was a convenient means to approach both the elite and the church-going masses.¹³⁶ Similarly, his hymns, in their various forms, were destined for church services, liturgical processions, or ceremonies in the palace. These uses are attested in various contemporary or near contemporary sources, in particular Arethas, the *Cleitorologion* and the *De ceremoniis* as well as by the liturgical books.¹³⁷

Furthermore, despite the rather bad press Leo has received in past scholarship, especially because he did not campaign in person and the empire suffered some significant military defeats,¹³⁸ the emperor’s hands-on interests found their expression in his military works and legislation. As his *Novels* make clear, his concern was the well-being of the

133. GROS DIDIER DE MATONS, *Trois études* (quoted n. 30), pp. 217, 220–1, 227–8.

134. *Hom.* 30, 244–5, p. 420. Cf. ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 86–7.

135. See ANTONOPOULOU, Unpublished scholia (quoted n. 32), p. 26 for the text and the originality of Leo’s interpretation of Paul’s word ἀκρασία.

136. ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 72–80 (chap. I.5: Political ideology in the *Homilies*). On the use of ideology in homiletics, see EAD., Beyond religion : homilies as conveyor of political ideology in Middle Byzantium, in *Ideologies and identities in the medieval Byzantine world*, ed. by Y. Stouraitis with the cooperation of O. Heilo, Berlin – New York (forthcoming).

137. For the relevant references, see ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 46–7.

138. See TOUGHER, *The reign of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 164–93 (chap. 7: Military matters). Especially for a critique of older views on Leo’s not leading campaigns, and a plausible explanation of this fact on the basis of his imitation of Justinian I and his wish to assert centralized authority from the capital, see further ID., The imperial thought-world of Leo VI : the non-campaigning emperor of the ninth century, in *Byzantium in the ninth century : dead or alive? Papers of the thirtieth spring symposium of Byzantine studies, Birmingham, March 1996*, ed. by L. Brubaker, Aldershot 1998, pp. 51–60.

citizens.¹³⁹ Leo strived for the ideals of equality (in the sense of equal treatment of all people in similar circumstances), justice, peace, piety, forgiveness, the emperor's virtue and love for his people, and the latter's consent, that is to say an ideal world, governed by deeply humane values. This becomes clear especially in the prooemia to the laws, which, as has been calculated, occupy two thirds of the whole text.¹⁴⁰ Marie Theres Fögen has noted Leo's courage or wisdom in opposing earlier laws in his own legislation, whenever he thought that the citizens' happiness would be better protected using other than strictly legal criteria, especially ideology, driven by religion and the Christian morality of love (even if, paradoxically, in this way he may appear today as an “enemy of the law”).¹⁴¹

To give but a couple of characteristic examples, Leo's “humanistic” attitude is evident in the prooemium to his *Novel 77*, which concerns forgery. This novel makes an eloquent case in favour of the view that laws ought to be clear and precise, while the lack of clarity (ἀσάφεια) and obscurity (σκολιὰ διάπλασις) should be condemned with regard to various issues, especially law. Leo goes on to argue that laws are not mysteries which should remain incomprehensible to *hoi polloi*, but that they must be comprehended by everybody, if possible, men, women, and children, since they help to improve, in the most effective way, the education (ἀγωγή) of the people and to bring usefulness (λυσιτέλεια) into their lives. Equal treatment by the law, justice for all, and personal improvement regardless of sex and age emerge as Leo's targets.¹⁴² He also issued *Novels 25–7* that

139. There is a rich and ever growing bibliography on the *Novels* and the legislation of Basil I and Leo VI; see especially the manuals of Byzantine legal literature and certain monographs, where further literature is found: N. van der WAL & J. H. A. LOKIN, *Historiae iuris graeco-romani delineatio : les sources du droit byzantin de 300 à 1453*, Groningen 1985, pp. 78–87, 132–3; SCHMINCK, *Studien* (quoted n. 9), *passim*; P. E. PIELER, Die klassizistische Epoche der byzantinischen Rechtsliteratur, in H. HUNGER, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner. 2, Philologie, Profandichtung, Musik, Mathematik und Astronomie, Naturwissenschaften, Medizin, Kriegswissenschaft, Rechtsliteratur* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft. Byzantinisches Handbuch 5, 2), München 1978, pp. 445–57 (revised edition and translation into Modern Greek in H. HUNGER, *Bυζαντινὴ λογοτεχνία : ἡ λόγια κοσμικὴ γραμματεία τῶν Βυζαντινῶν. Γ'*, Αθῆνα 1994, pp. 324–48); T. E. van BOCHOVE, *To date and not to date : on the date and status of Byzantine law books*, Groningen 1996, *passim*; TROIANOS, *Oι πηγές του βυζαντινού δικαίου* (quoted n. 98), pp. 212–32, 240–63; and *Introduzione al diritto bizantino : da Giustiniano ai Basilici*, a cura di J. H. A. Lokin e B. H. Stolte (Pubblicazioni del CEDANT 8), Pavia 2011, esp. the contributions by T. E. van BOCHOVE and J. SIGNES CODONER at pp. 239–322. See also next note.

140. See M. T. FÖGEN, Gesetz und Gesetzgebung in Byzanz : Versuch einer Funktionsanalyse, *Ius commune : Zeitschrift für europäische Rechtsgeschichte* 14, 1987, pp. 137–58, esp. 149–53. On Leo's legislation see further EAD., Legislation und Kodifikation des Kaisers Leon VI., *Subseciva Groningana* 3, 1989, pp. 23–35; D. SIMON, Legislation as both a world order and a legal order, in *Law and society in Byzantium : ninth–twelfth centuries*, ed. by A. E. Laiou & D. Simon, Washington DC 1994, pp. 1–25, esp. 18–25; G. DAGRON, Lawful society and legitimate power : "Ἐννομος πολιτεία, ἔννομος ὁρχή, *ibid.*, pp. 27–51, esp. 38–51; J. H. A. LOKIN, The significance of law and legislation in the law books of the ninth to eleventh centuries, *ibid.*, pp. 71–91, esp. 83–6; Leo VI, *Nov.*, pp. 411–577 (Appendix, containing eleven previously published studies by S. TROIANOS); also the studies referred to in the previous note as well as in the following notes.

141. FÖGEN, Leon liest Theophilos (quoted n. 29), p. 97.

142. On *Novel 77* and its implications, see BOURDARA, *H διάκριση των φύλων* (quoted n. 28), pp. 180–2.

criticized the *patria potestas* and aimed to make it a little less harsh towards the children.¹⁴³ In addition, the general view on women in Leo's legislation is positive and he makes no demeaning comment on them in the *Novels*, an attitude consistent with that expressed in the rest of his work. He was concerned with their welfare and legislated in their favour on many occasions. However, on the whole he sided with social conventions and custom regarding women and on a few occasions he discriminated against them.¹⁴⁴ For instance, he deprived them of their legal right to testify as witnesses to agreements for reasons of their public decorum, and in accordance to the prevailing custom (*Novel* 48).¹⁴⁵

In the *Novels* φιλανθρωπία is used as a major attribute of the emperor. The word has a long history in the Greek language and several interrelated meanings, such as humanity, benevolence, and kind-heartedness. As Herbert Hunger demonstrated, philanthropy characterized emperors from Roman times onwards up to the Palaeologan period, and it makes frequent appearances in Byzantine imperial legislation. In Leo's *Novels* it is particularly prominent and becomes a characteristic of the legislation itself; the latter is claimed to be even more benevolent than that of his predecessors.¹⁴⁶ To cite one among many examples, Leo issued two novels (the aforementioned nos. 26–7) allowing eunuchs and unmarried women to adopt children.

The same general benevolent approach to his subjects is encountered in the *Homilies*. There, his concern for the protection, instruction and well-being of the “people of God” and the “holy nation” entrusted to the emperor by God, and the effort for a better world are recurring themes.¹⁴⁷ Moreover, mildness and peacefulness were characteristic of Leo's personality according to the sources, and part of his official image.¹⁴⁸ It can be argued that his benevolence may be extended to include his relatively comprehensible style as evident in his works, especially the *Homilies*: whereas obscurity is not avoided, being demonstrated, for example, in the omnipresent circumlocutions that refuse to give people

143. FÖGEN, Leon liest Theophilos (quoted n. 29), esp. p. 96. It would not be too daring perhaps to suggest, although it cannot be proved, that Leo's personal ugly experience, when he had been beaten by his father, as mentioned above, may have affected him in this direction.

144. See K. FLEDELIUS, Woman's position and possibilities in Byzantine society, with particular reference to the *Novels* of Leo VI, in *XVI. Internationaler Byzantinistenkongress, Wien, 4.–9. Oktober 1981. Akten. 2, 2 (=JÖB, 32, 2)*, Wien 1982, pp. 425–32; BOURDARA, *H διάκριση των φύλων* (quoted n. 28), *passim*, esp. the Conclusions at pp. 183–7 on the varying attitude of the *Novels* towards women.

145. See BOURDARA, *H διάκριση των φύλων* (quoted n. 28), pp. 165–75 on *Novel* 48 and the importance attached by Leo to legislating on the basis of contemporaneous custom (with bibliography); also pp. 185–7.

146. See H. HUNGER, Φιλανθρωπία : eine griechische Wortprägung auf ihrem Wege von Aischylos bis Theodoros Metochites, *Anzeiger der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 100, 1963, pp. 1–20, esp. 15–6 on Leo's *Novels* with some examples; repr. in ID., *Byzantinische Grundlagenforschung : gesammelte Aufsätze* (Variorum reprints), London 1973, no. XII; and in more detail on the various meanings of *philanthropia* in Leo's *Novels*, Σ. Ν. ΤΡΩΙΑΝΟΣ [S. N. TROIANOS], Η ἔννοια της “φιλανθρωπίας” στους ιουστινιάνειους και μεταϊουστινιάνειους νόμους, *Byzantina* 29, 2009, pp. 13–43, esp. 19 ff. *passim*; cf. SCHMINCK, *Minima Byzantina* (quoted n. 115), esp. 1) Επιδιόρθωσις εἰς τὸ φιλανθρωπότερον, pp. 469–74 with relevant bibliography at nn. 2 and 13.

147. See ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 72–5.

148. See the list of sources for these attributes in TOUGHER, *The reign of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 130–1. Cf. also K. A. BOURDARA, Le modèle du bon souverain à l'époque de Léon VI le Sage et la Vie de Sainte Euphrosynè, in *Eὐψυχία* (quoted n. 22), vol. 1, pp. 109–17, esp. 113 for the relevant advice allegedly given to Leo by St. Euphrosyne in the tradition of the Mirrors of princes.

and things their proper names, his way of expression is clearly more lucid than that of Arethas, who was famous for his stylistic vagueness (*ἀσύφεια*).¹⁴⁹

On another side of his character, attested to mostly by external sources, Leo also demonstrated severity when it came to his opponents. Three occasions may be recalled to testify to this. The first was the severe corporal punishment of Theodore Santabarenos following a trial in 887, shortly after Leo came to power, on the grounds of conspiracy against him back in 883. The second was the torturing and burning of a certain Stylianos, the culprit of the attack on him in the church of St. Mokios in 903, as known from both his *Homily* 29 and the chronicles.¹⁵⁰ The third was the harsh treatment of Nicetas David and his disciples, according to the *Life of Euthymios* as well as the anonymous fragment of the *Life of Nicetas*, which is hostile to Leo.¹⁵¹ It should not be forgotten that Leo had acted as an ungrateful disciple, who had the errors of his teacher Photios read out from the pulpit of St. Sophia and sent him to his final exile. If not Leo himself, then his entourage would also act with severity. In the *Life of St. Basil the Younger*, we read that the saint was arrested in the reign of Leo and Alexander, his case was brought before them, and subsequently he was interrogated and tortured by the *parakoinomenos* Samonas.¹⁵² On some occasions, however, Leo did not punish the culprits of conspiracy with the severity due and in accordance to law, taking into account other, political and personal, considerations.¹⁵³ He also rehabilitated former enemies some time after their punishment.¹⁵⁴

It is worth making one last point concerning Leo’s preoccupations. It is nowadays more or less clear that Leo’s fame as regards his interest in astrology and divination was not just a matter of later legend, but was generated in his own lifetime. As mentioned above, S. Tougher gathered the instances in the Greek sources that bear witness to Leo’s interest in astronomy and the related astrology and the horoscopes as well as to his recognition as prophet. Among these instances, the contemporaries Symeon of Bulgaria and Leo Choirosphaktes hold a prominent place, followed by the tenth-century chronicles, namely the *Continuation of Theophanes* and Symeon Logothete.¹⁵⁵ Although “prophetic” qualities were believed to be inherent in rulers according to a tradition going back to the Old

149. Σ. Β. ΚΟΥΤΕΑΣ [S. KOUGEAS], *Ο Καισαρείας Αρέθας καὶ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ*, ἐν Ἀθήναις 1913; repr. (Epilecta 1), Athens 1985, pp. 83–4.

150. See TOUGHER, *The reign of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 74–84 on the trial of Santabarenos (and Photios), and 225–7 on Stylianos. On the relevance of *Hom. 29*, see ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 64–5.

151. See FLUSIN, Un fragment inédit. 2 (quoted n. 20), pp. 248–260; PASHALIDIS, *Νικήτας Δαβίδ Παφλαγών* (quoted n. 89), pp. 106–12.

152. See §§ 4–9, pp. 70–82, ed. D. F. SULLIVAN, A.-M. TALBOT & S. MCGRATH, *The Life of Saint Basil the Younger: critical edition and annotated translation of the Moscow version* (DOS 45), Washington DC 2014.

153. See the references to how Leo punished those that wronged him in Ει. ΧΡΗΣΤΟΥ [I. CHRESTOU], *Τάξις καὶ βία στην Κωνσταντινούπολη (600–1028)*, Αθήνα 2015, pp. 157–62.

154. TOUGHER, *The reign of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 85–7.

155. *Ibid.*, pp. 114, 116, 120–2 with references to previous scholarship; cf. above, p. 192. See also, P. MAGDALINO, *L’orthodoxie des astrologues : la science entre le dogme et la divination à Byzance, VII^e–XIV^e siècle* (Réalités byzantines 12), Paris 2006, pp. 70–1, 79.

Testament, and, in this sense, even Basil I was credited with a prediction,¹⁵⁶ in Leo's case there are too many testimonies to be ignored. In fact, we may add to them another contemporary witness, the aforementioned epigram on Theodoret, which inveighs against ancient oracles too vehemently for the attack to be coincidental rather than a reminder, by an elderly advisor, to the recipient of the book of the fallacy of divination.¹⁵⁷

In addition, one more piece of evidence may be pointed out here, which dates to his son's reign and implies such interests on Leo's part. It concerns anecdotal stories that circulated in the capital and may conceivably go back to Leo's times. In Liutprand of Cremona's *Antapodosis* (*Tit for Tat*), we read two stories about Leo VI with which Liutprand became acquainted during his visit to Constantinople in 949.¹⁵⁸ According to the first story, Leo went out on the streets of the city incognito in order to check the alertness and fidelity of the city guards (another hint at his practical concerns and playful mood). Maintaining that he was heading for a brothel, he was arrested three times for breaching the curfew and was finally imprisoned, while the third time he tried in vain to bribe the guards to release him. Subsequently, the truth was revealed, and good and bad guards were rewarded or punished accordingly. This story is probably an invention,¹⁵⁹ but one detail indirectly seems to tally with Leo's interest in astrology. When he exclaims that he exited the palace under bad omens, the guard replies ironically by supposedly examining the prisoner's horoscope, which confirms his bad luck. Later, when his imperial identity is revealed, Leo asks the guard to look at the horoscope again, this time in order to check the omens under which he himself entered the palace, thus proving that he possessed the true science of divination.

Similar is the case with the second episode, which Liutprand describes as "another farce" by the emperor. Leo, who is said to have had the habit of going around the palace when everybody was resting, entered the quarters of some palace guards and left a present of gold coins for each of the twelve guards while they were asleep. One of them was awake, however, and kept for himself all the gold. Afterwards, the emperor summoned the men and asked about their dreams, at which point the cunning guard narrated what had happened as if in his dream. The emperor burst into laughter, impressed by the guard's "prudence and vivacity of spirit," and let him keep all the gold. Moreover, in his final address to the guard, Leo refers ironically to the man's apparently divine gift of divination, which the guard had claimed for himself too (*Nam et me μαντην*

156. See *Life of Nicetas*, § 29, ll. 104–6, ed. FLUSIN, Un fragment inédit. 1 (quoted n. 20), p. 129, with reference to Prov. 16,10, by which the anonymous author, *ibid.*, ll. 102–3, explains that a prophecy of Leo's on his deathbed was not conscious.

157. See verses 7–10 in the edition of MARKOPOULOS, Έπιγραμμα (quoted n. 10), who, however, does not comment on a possible connection with Leo's interest in occult sciences; cf. *ibid.*, p. 38 n. 20. Cf. above, p. 200.

158. Book I, chaps. 11–2, pp. 10–3, ed. *Liudprandi Cremonensis Opera omnia*, cura et studio P. Chiesa (CCCM 156), Turnholti 1998; also, text with recent French transl. and commentary in Liutprand de Crémone, *Oeuvres*, présentation, trad. et commentaire par F. BOUGARD (Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes, Sources d'histoire médiévale 41), Paris 2015, pp. 90–101. For a reference to these stories from the point of view of the emperor's wisdom surpassing questionable science, see MAGDALINO, *L'orthodoxie des astrologues* (quoted n. 155), p. 79.

159. See the comment by J. SHEPARD, Aspects of moral leadership : the imperial city and lucre from legality, in *Authority in Byzantium* (quoted n. 19), pp. 9–30, esp. 15, 17 ("Tall story this may be").

καὶ οὐροπόλον [...] *esse*),¹⁶⁰ implying that in this way he resembled Leo. The emperor also recalls Lucian in order to advance the argument for the possible lack of truth in dreams. The story illustrates vividly the attested lighter side of the emperor’s character, always eager to play a prank on other people.¹⁶¹ In addition, it shows Leo as an educated man of humour, irony and intelligence, who sought these qualities in his interlocutor and appreciated them enough to reward a man who had cheated his comrades out of their money, but who after all was awake protecting the emperor when the others were asleep. At the same time, Leo appears to have had a reputation for divination and dream explanation, which he seems to have enjoyed.

V. LEO VI AND THE “FIRST BYZANTINE HUMANISM”

A major concern of Lemerle’s in *Le premier humanisme byzantin* was the history of education and the revival and growth of interest in ancient literature in the eighth to tenth centuries. In this choice, he obviously had in mind the basic features of Renaissance humanism. In a classic essay on it, Paul Oskar Kristeller wrote that Renaissance humanism was first and foremost the study of the classics, Greek and Latin, and while it entailed no “common philosophical doctrine,” it exhibited “a belief in the value of man and the humanities and in the revival of ancient learning.” He also stressed that despite its focus on non-religious intellectual interests, humanism was not as a whole pagan or anti-Christian and evolved within a Christian society and age. Of particular interest to us is that he also defined as Christian humanists “those scholars with a humanist classical and rhetorical training who explicitly discussed religious or theological problems in all or some of their writings.”¹⁶² With regard to Byzantium, in an old, but brilliant lecture, Joan Hussey argued for the combination of the classical humanist and the Christian ascetic traditions, in what she called pertinently “the medieval Greek tradition.” She insisted on the continuous coexistence of these two sides of Byzantine culture, highlighting the limitations imposed on classical humanism by the Christian tradition and, vice-versa, the enrichment of the latter by the former.¹⁶³ This approach can be seen as complementary to Lemerle’s, who focused on the secular, Hellenic side of Byzantium. It is also fruitful if we are to better understand the mentality of such exponents of the “First Byzantine humanism” as Photios and Arethas. After all, not even Psellos, considered a humanist *par excellence*, rejected Christianity but made contributions to Christian metaphysics.¹⁶⁴

160. On Greek in Liutprand’s works, see J. KODER, *Liutprand von Cremona und die griechische Sprache*, mit 8 Tafeln, in J. KODER & T. WEBER, *Liutprand von Cremona in Konstantinopel : Untersuchungen zum griechischen Sprachschatz und zu realienkundlichen Aussagen in seinen Werken* (Byzantina Vindobonensia 13), Wien 1980, pp. 15–70, esp. 29 on the phrase quoted here, which is an Iliadic citation.

161. Cf. TOUGHER, *The reign of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), p. 20, noting in passing Leo’s “mischiefous figure” as emerging from Liutprand’s account.

162. P. O. KRISTELLER, *Renaissance thought : the classic, scholastic, and humanist strains*, New York 1961², pp. 1–23, 70–91, esp. 8, 10, 20–2, 72–4, 86.

163. J. M. HUSSEY, *Ascetics and humanists in eleventh-century Byzantium*, London 1960, pp. 18, 21.

164. On Psellos, see *ibid.*, esp. p. 10.

The notion of a Christian humanism in Byzantium was clearly and forcefully supported by H. Hunger, who included Photios and Psellos as representative figures.¹⁶⁵

We may now attempt to recapitulate the results of the preceding exposition and ask ourselves whether Leo VI can be considered a humanist, or rather a Christian humanist. It should be noted that in recent years the Christian side of the emperor's interests has been duly accentuated. In particular, Paul Magdalino has argued that Leo was among the four individuals, the other three being Photios, Constantine VII, and Basil the Chamberlain, who between 843 and 1000 shaped a new Orthodox culture for Byzantium, one of its main characteristics being "a large outpouring of edifying and devotional literature."¹⁶⁶ This remark points in the right direction; at the same time, it stresses the devotional aspect of Leo's works, leaving aside the classicizing one. The religious contents of most of the surviving manuscripts of Leo's reign also led Bernard Flusin to speak, and correctly so, of the "christianisme savant" of the first Macedonian emperors, at the expense of the common notion of the revival of classical studies. However, he underlined the interest Leo exhibited in classical studies, as testified by the indirect evidence on the manuscript of Xenophon mentioned above.¹⁶⁷

It is clear that, unlike Photios or Arethas, Leo cannot be regarded as a classical scholar.¹⁶⁸ This is not to say that he exhibited no interest at all in what could be described as scholarly, philological activity, since such awareness is mirrored in his few exegetical scholia on major Christian texts, that is, the Epistles of St. Paul and the *Ladder*. This remained, however, a minor part of his interests and, nevertheless, it did not concern profane classical literature. Furthermore, his religious works, the *Homilies*, the *Guidance*, the hymns and the *Song of compunction*, could as a whole satisfy even the ascetics in their approach to Christianity. But Leo was a very learned man with wide, if not in-depth, command of a considerable range of ancient pagan literature, both school texts and rarer ones, apart from patristic and later Christian literature. His remarkable profane classical and postclassical *paeideia*, the indications for ancient and late antique texts at his disposal, and the use he made of his literary knowledge in his own works, in order to serve his intellectual, spiritual and practical interests, make him an indispensable and major part of the construction of middle Byzantine humanism. The fact that his literary work was heavily religious only at first sight contradicts such an admission, given that even his *Homilies* are replete with profane quotations and ancient myths, erotic ones at that, and are characteristic of the classicizing trend of homiletics in the period in question. Not least, in a way comparable to Renaissance humanistic writings, which were notable for their clarity of style, Leo condemned obscurity in legal discourse, as revealed in his *Novel 77*.

165. H. HUNGER, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner. 1, Philosophie, Rhetorik, Epistolographie, Geschichtsschreibung, Geographie* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft. Byzantinisches Handbuch 5, 1), München 1978, pp. 49–53 (Chap. I.3: Philosophie und Theologie. Der christliche Humanismus).

166. P. MAGDALINO, Orthodoxy and Byzantine cultural identity, in *Orthodoxy and heresy in Byzantium*, ed. by A. Rigo & P. Ermilov (Quaderni di Nέα Πόμη 4), Roma 2010, pp. 21–40, esp. 34–5.

167. B. FLUSIN, Le livre et l'empereur sous les premiers Macédoniens, *Bulgaria mediaevalis* 3, 2012, pp. 71–84, esp. 75, 79 with n. 30.

168. It is no wonder, therefore, that Leo is not included in WILSON, *Scholars*, which traces the work of Greek philologists in Byzantium. Cf. above, p. 196.

commented upon above, even though he succumbed to rhetorical circumlocutions in his literary works, especially the *Homilies* as well as the *Guidance*.

With regard to the emphasis Leo placed on the dignity of man—a feature *sine qua non* of Renaissance humanism with its anthropocentric character—, especially as present in Leo’s legal thought, it cannot be seen in the light of antiquity alone while detaching it from the Christian tradition. In fact, for Leo, Christianity was the main carrier of human values and of the value of the human being. Nevertheless, his own view of Christianity was impregnated with what could be described as his personal attitude to “humanism,” which was condescending to human weakness and characterized by moderation in the life of secular people and monks alike, as discussed above and evident throughout his works. However, whether such an attitude resulted only or mainly from his classical readings is highly doubtful.

In accordance with the picture drawn here, it can be argued that Leo combined the two traditions, the secular/Hellenic and the Christian/ascetic, and can be viewed as a real “Christian humanist” figure with broad interests, practical and literary. In this respect, an ultimate model for Leo was Gregory of Nazianzus. This transpires from the extended usage of Gregory’s homilies, the imitation of the way he combined myths and doctrine in certain homilies, the manner of attacking heretics of old, and certain expressions which Leo borrowed and embedded in his writings. Perhaps even the fact that the mention of old heresies stops at those of Gregory’s time is not accidental, but a mark of the extent of the imitation of the Father and his influence on Leo’s formation. Perhaps even the idea of a collection of sermons for the ecclesiastical year went back to the collections of Gregory’s *Orations*. It can be no coincidence that the famous *Parisinus gr. 510*, containing 42 homilies of Gregory, was certainly known to Leo, being a manuscript with portraits of Basil I’s family, copied for Basil and being kept in the palace. The probability that it was Photios who masterminded this manuscript¹⁶⁹ suits the intellectual climate in which Leo grew up, with Photios being the intermediary between Leo and the works of the Father (as in the case of the employment of myths in homilies). Gregory’s influence on Leo is important because he can be considered as Leo’s Christian intellectual model, possessing, as he did, a vast classical learning, while being a paragon of orthodoxy. Opposed to this model were the austere ascetics, depicted in the *Ladder*, which Leo read and commented upon, but who did not represent his own paradigm of life.

As far as the history of the “First Byzantine humanism” is concerned, given our present-day knowledge, the emperor would have constituted an important autonomous chapter in Lemerle’s book, forming a link between the emblematic figures of Photios and Constantine VII, the distance between whom cannot be covered by the focus on Arethas alone. What is more, Leo can indeed be considered as a ring in the chain of Byzantine Christian humanists, in-between Photios and Michael Psellos, although still far away from the latter. Incidentally, Psellos did not think highly of the literary activity

169. As suggested by L. BRUBAKER, Politics, patronage, and art in ninth-century Byzantium : the *Homilies* of Gregory of Nazianzus in Paris (B.N. GR. 510), *DOP* 39, 1985, pp. 1–13, esp. 6–13; see also EAD., *Vision and meaning in ninth-century Byzantium : image as exegesis in the homilies of Gregory of Nazianzus*, Cambridge 1999, esp. the conclusions at pp. 412–4.

of the emperor,¹⁷⁰ who, to some extent, had also paved the way for him one and a half centuries earlier.

A comparison of Leo with Photios easily shows some distinguishing qualities of theirs. Photios was an accomplished scholar and theologian, while Leo was very well-read, yet with no particular interest in scholarship and theology. Photios was a great stylist in his writings, while Leo was following in Photios' footsteps in literary matters, although he also cultivated his personal style and literary interests. Photios was an enlightened, but strict hierarch, while Leo was an enlightened secular monarch with no austere Christian ethic, which he subjugated to his political interests.

Undoubtedly, Leo knew his classics and used them, but, probably under the influence of the teaching he had received, his writings convey the impression that he did not feel free enough to love them. His ambivalent attitude towards the erotic myths of antiquity is characteristic: they are enchanting, yet they display promiscuity and polytheism, and are counterexamples for the flock. The spirit of antiquity is not revived.¹⁷¹ What is more, there was possible danger involved in open fascination with antiquity at the time. Relevant insight is offered by the case of Leo Choirosphaktes, a diplomat close to the emperor and a relative of his, who was attacked by Arethas as an atheist and by Constantine the Rhodian as an Hellene, a pagan. Moreover, Arethas himself was twice accused of impiety in the first decade of the tenth century, the second time the real reason certainly being his stance in the tetragamy affair, but he was acquitted of the charges.¹⁷² The era was apparently still very tentative when confronted with literati particularly interested in antique authors, which makes the stance of these individuals all the more important for their emerging humanism.¹⁷³

Furthermore, despite his alleged interest in the teaching of philosophy,¹⁷⁴ Leo did not consider philosophy among his own interests, possessing not a theoretical but a practical mindset, as argued above. This inclination of his was a major reason why he chose practical Christianity to express theology and his own religious and intellectual concerns, by composing homilies and hymns for the masses that attended liturgy, as well as the guide to monks. At the same time, he never lost sight of his imperial status and his work always served the interests of the crown. In the absence of imperial orations

170. See Psellos, *Historia syntomos*, chap. 100, ll. 13–9, p. 90.

171. ANTONOPOULOU, Christian homilies, ancient myths (quoted n. 48), pp. 619–20.

172. On Choirosphaktes, see Leon Magistros Choirosphaktes, *Chiliostichos theologia : editio princeps*, Einl., kritischer Text, Übers., Kommentar, Indices besorgt von I. Vassis (Supplementa Byzantina 6), Berlin – New York 2002, pp. 7–10 with bibliography. On Arethas' correspondence (*Epistles* 66 and 72) which bears witness to the accusations, see KOUGEAS, Ο Καισαρείας Ἀρέθας (quoted n. 149), pp. 24–5; *Vita Euthymii*, p. 203. Cf. also the later accusation of Psellos against Kerouarios, whom he charged with “hellenism” (ἔλληνισμός, in the meaning of “astrology and magic and spiritualism”); see HUSSEY, *Ascetics and humanists* (quoted n. 163), p. 8.

173. Cf. the relevant remarks of H.-G. BECK, *Das byzantinische Jahrtausend*, München 1978, p. 128; A. GARZYA, Visages de l'hellénisme dans le monde byzantin (IV^e–XII^e siècles), *Byz.* 55, 1985, pp. 463–82; and from another perspective, A. KALDELLIS, *Hellenism in Byzantium : the transformations of Greek identity and the reception of the classical tradition*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 173–87 (“Hellenism in limbo: the middle years [400–1040]”), esp. 180–3.

174. See above, p. 191 with n. 20, on the offer of a teaching position in philosophy to Nicetas David.

written for him (apart from the praise bestowed on him in some speeches of Arethas),¹⁷⁵ the *Homilies*, which were a vehicle of imperial propaganda,¹⁷⁶ could even be seen as a sort of imperial orations by and for himself, focusing on his Christian side.

The tetragamy affair shattered Leo's ambitions to function as the spiritual father of the Christian people. His literary activity dropped significantly, his preaching activity too, as he was first barred from entering church, then, after being granted dispensation in March 907, he had to observe penance.¹⁷⁷ His ideal of the combination of the political, intellectual and spiritual guidance in the person of the emperor collapsed, only to be revived in part by his son, Constantine VII, who despite his lack of higher education and the difficult circumstances of his early reign, moved close to his father's ideal upon his coming to sole power. His personal restrictions forced him, in a way, to rely on other people for many of the writings that come under his name, and for accomplishing the projects he had in mind. On the contrary, his father had been secure in his knowledge and endowed with a substantial talent for writing, which he applied successfully for the sake of his own reputation. What is more, Leo set the example for his son in favouring an atmosphere to be created that allowed or even encouraged literati to flourish.

This is not the place to analyze the cultural activity of his reign, which would require a separate study. However, I have briefly presented some aspects of it elsewhere,¹⁷⁸ and various problems have been successfully explored by several scholars in recent years. There is more work to be done in this respect, yet a brief recapitulation of the written culture of the time should at least be made here.

In the area of jurisprudence, Leo's name is inextricably woven with the production, under his supervision, of such a massive and fundamental legal corpus as the *Basilica* (*Βασιλικὰ ξ' βιβλία*). The work revisits the codifying work of Basil I and rearranges Justinian's *Corpus iuris civilis* and *Novels* into sixty books, based for the Latin texts on mostly preexistent Greek paraphrases, epitomes and commentaries.¹⁷⁹ Not only did Leo oversee the creation of the corpus, but contributed to it personally by incorporating measures legislated in his *Novels*.¹⁸⁰ He also encouraged the production of the *Cleto-rologion* of Philotheos, which is dedicated to him, and commissioned the *Book of the eparch* which

175. For the fact that no imperial orations were written for Leo VI or his son, see N. RADOŠEVIĆ, The emperor as the patron of learning in Byzantine basilikoi logoi, in *To Ελληνικόν : studies in honor of Speros Vryonis, Jr. I, Hellenic antiquity and Byzantium*, ed. by J. S. LANGDON et al., New Rochelle NY 1993, pp. 267–87, esp. 281. On the speeches of Arethas which praise the emperor, see M. LOUKAKI, Notes sur l'activité d'Aréthas comme rhéteur de la cour de Léon VI, in *Theatron* (quoted n. 53), pp. 259–75.

176. As mentioned above, p. 216 with n. 136.

177. On these events, see TOUGHER, *The reign of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 162–3.

178. ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 16–8.

179. For an overview, see, for example, TROIANOS, *Oι πηγές των βυζαντινού δικαίου* (quoted n. 98), p. 258. For the suggestion of a translation of a particular constitution in the eighties of the ninth century, see SCHMINCK, *Subsiciva Byzantina* (quoted n. 19).

180. On the precedence of part of the *Novels* and the complex problem of their relation to the *Basilica*, see in particular FÖGEN, Legislation und Kodifikation (quoted n. 140); contra, SIGNES CODOÑER, The corpus of Leo's *Novels* (quoted n. 115), pp. 30–3; partly following FÖGEN, TROIANOS, *Oι πηγές των βυζαντινού δικαίου* (quoted n. 98), pp. 222–9. It should not go unmentioned here that the *Prochiron* and the original text of the so-called *Epitome legum* are also connected with Leo VI; discussion on them, in particular regarding their dates, is ongoing; see esp. SCHMINCK, *Studien* (quoted

comes under his name.¹⁸¹ These works were the outcome of a creative process entailing not just the collection and copying, but also the reworking of the available material into new compositions regarding specific sides of the administration of the empire. In addition, on the evidence of Constantine VII's words, a former senior military officer, the *magistros* Leo Katakylas, received orders from Leo to collect materials for a treatise on imperial expeditions, a duty which he accomplished, enabling Constantine to later compose his own treatise on the subject.¹⁸² The dedication to Leo of Theognostos' *Orthography* was noted above. It should also be mentioned that, although the first edition of the Constantinopolitan *Synaxarion* as we know it was compiled by Evaristos under the auspices of Constantine VII, its precursor as surviving in the hagiographical parts of codex *Patmiacus* 266, probably dates back to around 900.¹⁸³ In addition, a number of poetic anthologies and collections were formed. The most famous among them was the anthology of epigrams by Constantine Cephalas, from which the Greek Anthology was derived, and which dates from the very end of the ninth century. Cephalas was close to the court, since he taught at the school of the Nea Church and in 917 he was *protopapas* at the palace.¹⁸⁴ An older teacher at the same school, Gregory of Kampsa, had collected verse inscriptions, which Cephalas incorporated in his anthology.¹⁸⁵ Still in the environment of Leo, the anonymous *Sylloge Euphemiana*, also derived from Cephalas', was compiled. The last distich of the first of two epigrams of dedication to Euphemios contains an encomium of the emperor.¹⁸⁶ In light of the above, the activity of Leo and his

n. 9), chaps. 3 and 4 respectively; BOCHOVE, *To date and not to date* (quoted n. 139), esp. chaps. 2–3 on the former; and the manuals of Byzantine law mentioned above at n. 139.

181. *Cleitorologion*, ed. OIKONOMIDES, *Listes*, pp. 81–235; *Das Eparchenbuch Leons des Weisen*, Einführung, Ed., Übers. und Indices von J. Koder (CFHB 33), Wien 1991.

182. See Text C, ll. 24–39, pp. 94–6, Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *Three treatises on imperial military expeditions*, introd., ed., transl. and commentary by J. F. Haldon (CFHB 28), Wien 1990 for Constantine's testimony, and Text B, pp. 82–92, as that of Katakylas; cf. the editor's arguments, pp. 40–6, 56, 180–2.

183. A. LUZZI, *Synaxaria and the Synaxarion of Constantinople*, in *The Ashgate research companion to Byzantine hagiography*. 2 (quoted n. 13), pp. 197–208, esp. 200–2 with bibliography; also, ID., *Studi sul Sinasario di Costantinopoli* (Testi e studi bizantino-neoellenici 8), Roma 1995.

184. See LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine poetry* (quoted n. 27), pp. 86–98; ID., *The Anthology of Cephalas*, in *Byzantinische Sprachkunst* (quoted n. 32), pp. 194–208; also, F. MALTOMINI, Selezione e organizzazione della poesia epigrammatica fra IX e X secolo : la perduta antologia di Costantino Cefala e l'*Antologia Palatina*, in *Encyclopedic trends in Byzantium? Proceedings of the international conference held in Leuven, 6–8 May 2009*, ed. by P. Van Deun & C. Macé (OLA 212), Leuven 2012, pp. 109–24.

185. See LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine poetry* (quoted n. 27), pp. 73–4.

186. CAMERON, *The Greek Anthology* (quoted n. 27), pp. 254–6 followed by LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine poetry* (quoted n. 27), pp. 86–7, 114–6; for a different view of its nature and relation to Cephalas' anthology, see F. MALTOMINI, *Tradizione antologica dell'epigramma greco : le sillogi minori di età bizantina e umanistica* (Pleiadi 9), Roma 2008, pp. 79–94, 109–110. The epigram in question is no. 256, *Epigrammatum Anthologia Palatina cum Planudeis et appendice nova*. 3, instruxit E. Cougny, Parisiis 1890.

contemporaries announces the “encyclopaedic” activity of his successor Constantine VII,¹⁸⁷ when the “collecting culture” peaked.¹⁸⁸

Furthermore, the time of Leo saw the literary activity of a large number of literati, with or without ties to the court, whom there is no need to enumerate or discuss here.¹⁸⁹ They were active in various fields: poetry,¹⁹⁰ letter-writing,¹⁹¹ rhetoric,¹⁹² homiletics,¹⁹³ hagiography,¹⁹⁴ even historiography, though no actual work has survived,¹⁹⁵ and also

187. On the relationship of Constantine’s works to those of his father, see the remarks of MAGDALINO, Non-juridical legislation (quoted n. 96), pp. 173–9; also Id., Knowledge in authority (quoted n. 19), pp. 190–3, 197–209; Id., Orthodoxy and history in tenth-century Byzantine encyclopedism, in *Encyclopedic trends* (quoted n. 184), pp. 143–60, esp. 149–50; Id., Byzantine encyclopaedism of the ninth and tenth centuries, in *Encyclopaedism from antiquity to the Renaissance*, ed. by J. König & G. Woolf, Cambridge 2013, pp. 219–31.

188. On the “collecting culture”, see P. ODORICO, La cultura della Συλλογή, *BZ* 83, 1990, pp. 1–21; Id., Cadre d’exposition/cadre de pensée : la culture du recueil, in *Encyclopedic trends* (quoted n. 184), pp. 89–107; P. SCHREINER, Die enzyklopädische Idee in Byzanz, *ibid.*, pp. 3–25 for a review of “encyclopaedism” in Byzantium.

189. For a useful overview of the literary production of Leo’s era, see KAZHDAN, *A history of Byzantine literature* (quoted n. 13), pp. 53–131 (Chaps. 3–7).

190. On the rich poetic production of Leo’s times, see LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine poetry* (quoted n. 27), *passim* (e.g. pp. 49, 114–8, 229–30, 232, mentioning poets such as the Anonymous compiler of the *Sylloge Euphemiana*, Thomas the Patrician, Constantine the Rhodian, the poet of an epitaph on Leo’s first wife Theophano, and Leo Choirosphaktes).

191. There is no special treatment of the epistolography of this period, but for the surviving letters of literati who were active in Leo’s reign and beyond, see *Epistularum Byzantinarum initia*, conscripsit M. Grünbart, Hildesheim – Zürich – New York 2001, esp. pp. 7*–40* (list of Byzantine “Briefschreiber”, among whom, notably, are Arethas and Nicetas David); Id., Byzantinische Briefflorilegien : Kopieren und Sammeln zur Zeit der Makedonenkaiser, in *Encyclopedic trends* (quoted n. 184), pp. 77–88; also Id., *Formen der Anrede im byzantinischen Brief vom 6. bis zum 12. Jahrhundert* (WBS, 25), Wien 2005, *passim*; cf. also the next note.

192. KAZHDAN, *A history of Byzantine literature* (quoted n. 189), pp. 53–90 (Chap. 3: Eloquence around 900: the “School” of Photios) deals especially with rhetoric, homiletics and epistolography as practiced by Leo VI, Nicholas I and Arethas as well as some other figures. Cf. also the previous and next notes.

193. The study of the homiletic activity of the reign has revealed a rich body of texts by a considerable number of authors. Apart from Leo VI, the most productive homilist was the aforementioned Nicetas David. See T. ANTONOPOULOU, Homiletic activity in Constantinople around 900, in *Preacher and audience : studies in early Christian and Byzantine homiletics*, ed. by M. Cunningham & P. Allen (A new history of the sermon 1), Leiden – Boston – Köln 1998, pp. 317–48, esp. the “Conclusion” at 343–5; supplemented for some preachers in EAD., A survey of tenth-century homiletic literature, *Parekbolai* 1, 2011, pp. 7–36, esp. 8–15; both studies in Greek translation with some updating of the former (necessary due to the lapse of time) in EAD., *Βυζαντινή ομιλητική : συγγραφείς και κείμενα*, Αθήνα 2013, pp. 70–112 and 113–57 respectively.

194. EFTHYMIADIS, Hagiography (quoted n. 51), pp. 114–21 (“Hagiography in and about the age of Leo VI the Wise [886–912]”); it should be noted that the hagiographical encomia noted here overlap with the homilies on saints included in the studies mentioned in the previous note. Also, B. FLUSIN, L’hagiographie monastique à Byzance au IX^e et au X^e siècle : modèles anciens et tendances contemporaines, *Revue bénédictine* 103, 1993 (= *Le monachisme à Byzance et en Occident du VIII^e au X^e siècle : aspects internes et relations avec la société*, éd. par A. Dierkens, D. Misonne & J.-M. Sansterre, Maredsous 1993), pp. 31–50.

195. TREADGOLD, *The middle Byzantine historians* (quoted n. 19), pp. 121–52 (chap. 4: Historians under Leo VI); also, A. MARKOPOULOS, Le public des textes historiographiques à l’époque macédonienne,

hymnography.¹⁹⁶ Finally, it is common knowledge that in the ninth and tenth centuries there was a strong demand for ancient and late antique texts, which were put to various uses. Photios' *Bibliotheca* is the mirror *par excellence* of this demand in the ninth century and Constantine VII's *Excerpta* in the tenth. Less well known was the activity in the reigns of Basil I and, especially, Leo VI. Nigel Wilson has given an account of the manuscripts of classical interest copied at the end of the ninth century and the beginning of the tenth—apart from those connected to the activity of Arethas—, which included, for instance, the most ancient codices of Isocrates and Demosthenes, without making a direct connection between them and the emperor or the palace.¹⁹⁷ P. Magdalino has pointed out the production of astronomical manuscripts in the ninth century, among which two codices of Ptolemy were copied in Leo's reign.¹⁹⁸ More recently, B. Flusin compiled a list of the manuscripts, dated or not, that can be related to the emperor, his reign and his court. They reveal the influence of the court on book production, on the layout and quality of the books, and on calligraphy as demonstrated in the naissance of the *bouletée*.¹⁹⁹ The evidence of book epigrams on three lost manuscripts dedicated to Leo was mentioned above.²⁰⁰ A case apart is the fundamental manuscript of Photios' *Bibliotheca*, Marc. gr. 450, which was written before the end of the ninth century by seven different hands.²⁰¹ It may well have been copied under Photios' supervision during his first or second exile.²⁰² Unsurprisingly, there is no connection between the production of this manuscript and an incentive on the part of the emperor.

In conclusion, Leo VI with his court and Constantinopolitan environments, which included major scholarly figures like Arethas and Cephalas, as well as those exclusively religious such as Nicetas David, set the intellectual and literary tone of the decades around the turn of the ninth century and beyond.²⁰³ Leo's contribution is far clearer now than it used to be, when his literary oeuvre had not yet been studied. Thus, Nicephorus Gregoras'

Parekbolai 5, 2015, pp. 53–74; also, J. SIGNES CODÓÑER, Theophanes at the time of Leo VI, *TM* 19, 2015 (= *Studies in Theophanes*, ed. by M. Jankowiak & F. Montinaro, Paris 2015), pp. 159–76.

196. There is no recent study of the hymnographic production of the period; see, however, the older overview by H.-G. BECK, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft. Byzantinisches Handbuch 2, 1), München 1959, esp. pp. 601–5.

197. WILSON, *Scholars*, pp. 136–7.

198. MAGDALINO, *L'orthodoxie des astrologues* (quoted n. 155), p. 80 with bibliography.

199. FLUSIN, *Le livre et l'empereur* (quoted n. 167), pp. 72–3, 75–83 with previous literature.

200. See above on the book epigrams concerning Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, Theodoret of Cyrrhus' *Cure of pagan maladies*, and Urbicius' *Tacticon*, pp. 196–7 with n. 44, p. 200 with n. 57, and pp. 192–3 with n. 27 respectively.

201. For the differentiation of these hands, see G. CAVALLO, *Per le mani e la datazione del codice Ven. Marc. Gr. 450, Quaderni di storia : rassegna di antichità redatta nell'Istituto di storia greca e romana dell'Università di Bari* 25, no. 49, 1999, pp. 157–62 with 12 plates on pp. 163–74.

202. See L. CANFORA, Postilla, *Quaderni di storia* 25, no. 49, 1999, pp. 175–7 (on the basis of the article quoted in the previous footnote).

203. A characteristic contemporary example of a homily displaying a remarkable profane culture is the encomium of St. Demetrios by Gregory the Referendary (pronounced on the saint's feast in 904 or 905 in the palatine chapel dedicated to the saint, in the presence of Leo and his brother Alexander); see M. DETORAKI, *L'éloge de saint Démétrios par Grégoire le Référendaire (BHG 544)*, *REB* 73, 2015, pp. 5–55, esp. 21–3, who remarks that “Gregory, like Leo VI or Arethas, used without fear pagan authors for decorating a specifically Christian discourse, thus being a good representative of the culture reigning at the court of Leo VI”.

description, in his homily on Theophano, of the intellectual climate in the palace as that of a new Academy or a new Lyceum, despite its exaggeration, gains its justification.²⁰⁴

VI. THE BYZANTINE RECEPTION OF LEO VI’S LITERARY WORKS: SOME REMARKS

An author’s influence upon his contemporaries and posterity is an intricate and multifaceted subject that cannot easily be evaluated. Various courses can be taken. The case of Leo is a peculiar one, in that his name and image acquired a legendary status with posterity, being primarily connected with divination and prophecy, as was explained above. It has been clear for a long time that as a result of this, a considerable number of works that have nothing to do with him came to be attributed to him.²⁰⁵ I will not go into this issue again, except to recall a couple of new additions to the previously known list. The first is a pseudonymous epistolary, namely a collection of exemplary letters, which existed by the first half of the fourteenth century and survives in two manuscripts.²⁰⁶ The second is a theological work in question-and-answer form, wrongly attributed to Leo in its post-Byzantine manuscripts. This text, which had escaped scholarly attention, has turned out to have been published long ago in an obscure publication.²⁰⁷ Finally, it is worth noting an anonymous theological work, partly in question-and-answer form, whose unique manuscript dates from the fourteenth century. The work contains an extract from a legislative text belonging to the tradition of the *Eisagoge* (promulgated in the name of Emperors Basil I, Leo and Alexander), and placed under Leo’s name alone. Other than that, there is no connection to the emperor, as had been maintained in the past. The case reveals the influence of legal works connected to the emperor on works that have nothing to do with legislation.²⁰⁸

The reception of Leo’s genuine works by other authors has not been fully investigated as yet and will only become apparent with time. New critical editions and studies of later works, to the extent that they trace their sources, will hopefully reveal passages taken over from Leo’s works or displaying their influence. However, some cases have become known already and are worth recapitulating here.

204. Ed. KURTZ, *Zwei griechische Texte* (quoted n. 85), p. 40,27–30.

205. See especially the classic study of C. MANGO, The legend of Leo the Wise, *ZRVI* 6, 1960, pp. 59–93; repr. in Id., *Byzantium and its image*, London 1984, no. XVI; J. IRMSCHER, Die Gestalt Leons VI des Weisen in Volkssage und Historiographie, in *Beiträge zur byzantinischen Geschichte im 9.–11. Jahrhundert*, hrsg. von V. Vávřínek, Praha 1978, pp. 205–24; cf. ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 21–3. No clear distinction is made between genuine and non-genuine works in HALDON, *A critical commentary* (quoted n. 14), pp. 11–2.

206. T. ANTONOPOULOU, An epistolary attributed to Leo the Wise, *JÖB* 47, 1997, pp. 73–9 with the edition and study of its preface, which proves its pseudonymous character; EAD., Ἐντολὴ του Φειδο-Λέοντος του Σοφού : EBE 2429, *Hellenica* 49, 1999, pp. 147–9; cf. F. SPINGOU, Thinking about letters : the epistolary of “Leo the Wise” reconsidered, *Annual of medieval studies at Central European University* 21, 2015, pp. 177–92, who republishes (with minor changes) the preface from one of the two manuscripts with an English translation.

207. For details see T. ANTONOPOULOU, A theological *opusculum* allegedly by Emperor Leo VI the Wise, in *Myriobiblos* (quoted n. 71), pp. 39–54, esp. 39 with n. 2.

208. See *ibid.*, p. 49 for the edition of the fragment.

It has long been maintained, even though not universally accepted, that the rhetorical and partly historical *Funeral oration* served as a direct model for Constantine VII's *Life of Basil I* in terms of structure and parallels in content and expression.²⁰⁹ Notably, Constantine appears to have drawn his grandfather's genealogy from his father's work and to have used the *Oration* as a basis for expanding on Basil's legend.²¹⁰

In fact, during the next two to three generations from the time of Leo's death, court orators and other writers knew and used Leo's *Homilies*, even if anonymously. Several cases have been identified so far and the list is bound to expand. The first is a homily on the Translation of the relics of St. John Chrysostom, which bears the name of his son Constantine VII (*BHG* 878d) and draws on Leo's respective homily (no. 41).²¹¹ Constantine used *Homily* 41 again when composing his homily on the Translation of the relics of St. Gregory of Nazianzus (*BHG* 728).²¹² Another case is a sermon on the Birth of John the Baptist by Theodore Daphnopates, who quoted Leo's respective homily (no. 42).²¹³ In addition, passages from the emperor's *Homily on the life of John Chrysostom* (no. 38) have been traced in two Lives of the saint composed in the tenth century. The so-called Anonymous of Savile drew on Leo VI,²¹⁴ whom he mentions explicitly among his sources. Similarly, the so-called Anonymous of Vatopedi drew independently on the emperor's work.²¹⁵ Curiously, these three homilies of Leo (nos. 38, 41, 42) had been left out of the second edition of his *Special panegyricon*, but apparently were still available in the palace and the capital in the tenth century (*Hom.* 38 probably as part of the first edition of the *Panegyricon*). A little later in the same century, Symeon Metaphrastes made use of Leo's *Homily* 17 on St. Demetrios for his *Life* of the saint.²¹⁶

This was not all. In the Norman kingdom of Sicily in the twelfth century Philagathos Kerameus' ecphrasis of the Cappella Palatina appears to have been inspired by the ecphrases found in Leo's *Homilies* 31 and 37, particularly the latter. The examination of the manuscript tradition of Leo's *Panegyricon* offers credence to the suggestion of

209. As pointed out by P. J. ALEXANDER, Secular biography at Byzantium, *Speculum* 15, 1940, pp. 194–209, esp. 206–7; also, LEMERLE, *Premier humanisme*, p. 275 with n. 31; MARKOPOULOS, Οἱ μεταμορφώσεις τῆς “μυθολογίας” τοῦ Βασιλείου Α' (quoted n. 75), pp. 965–6. Against such a supposition, see C. MANGO, “Introduction” to *Vita Basili*, pp. 10*–11* with n. 18, who proposes the existence of a lost encomium composed in Leo's reign as Constantine's source; TREADGOLD, *The middle Byzantine historians* (quoted n. 19), pp. 167–8.

210. See MARKOPOULOS, Le public des textes historiographiques (quoted n. 195), pp. 65–6.

211. B. FLUSIN, Le panégyrique de Constantin VII Porphyrogénète pour la translation des reliques de Grégoire le Théologien (*BHG* 728), *REB* 57, 1999, pp. 5–97, esp. 29–30.

212. See *ibid.*, pp. 9, 15, 29–31 and the *apparatus fontium* to his edition of *BHG* 728.

213. T. ANTONOPOULOU, A textual source and its contextual implications : on Theodore Daphnopates' sermon *On the birth of John the Baptist*, *Byz.* 81, 2011, pp. 9–17.

214. See T. ANTONOPOULOU, The unedited Life of St. John Chrysostom by Nicetas David the Paphlagonian : an introduction, *Byz.* 86, 2016, pp. 1–51, esp. 24–5, 32.

215. *Ibid.*, p. 32.

216. See ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 135–6. This source of Symeon's is not mentioned in C. HØGEL, *Symeon Metaphrastes : rewriting and canonization*, Copenhagen 2002, p. 183.

Philagathos’ direct contact with those works.²¹⁷ Furthermore, the use of Leo’s *Tactica* has been speculated, not without reason, to have formed part of the education of Roger II of Sicily.²¹⁸

Leo’s literary influence is also displayed in later texts specifically commenting on his works. Within the group of the recited metrical prefaces, one consisting of 33 verses by the eminent fourteenth-century poet Manuel Philes served as preface to Leo’s *Homily 21* on St. Nicholas, the public recital of which it preceded.²¹⁹ Another relevant case is an eight-verse laudatory poem which praises Leo for his *Homilies*. It is attested only in the nineteenth century, but probably dates from the tenth.²²⁰ Various other contemporary and later literary testimonies to his works also survive.²²¹

Furthermore, Leo’s enduring authority in religious matters emerges from the copying of his aforementioned *Scholia*—one of which at least was probably of oral origin—amidst marginal scholia by other authors. Three scholia on the Acts and on two Epistles of St. Paul are contained in a luxurious New Testament codex of the first third of the tenth-century (*Regin. gr. 29*), while a famous illuminated codex of the *Ladder of John the Sinaite* from the end of the eleventh century (*Vatic. gr. 394*) transmits Leo’s two scholia on this text.²²²

Last but not least, the extent of the manuscript tradition allows an evaluation of the diffusion and readership of a work, and of the influence of its author. The over 100 manuscripts that contain Leo’s *Homilies*, either as a corpus (*Special panegyricon*) or as a selection of one or more homilies, date from the tenth to the nineteenth century and are an unequivocal testimony to the continuing popularity of at least some of them. In the introduction to the edition of the *Homilies*, I have drawn certain tables showing the varying number of copies of each of the homilies over the centuries. Not unexpectedly, the monastic circles for which these manuscripts were primarily written hardly paid any attention to the homilies which are of the greatest interest to us nowadays from a historical or art-historical viewpoint: the *Funeral oration* survives in just one Byzantine copy (codex *B*) and its nineteenth-century apograph (codex *G*), which is also the case with some of the other circumstantial discourses (nos. 22, 31, 35, 37). It is noteworthy that Leo’s collection of homilies enjoyed popularity in the Greek monasteries of the Norman kingdom of Sicily mentioned above, from which the main manuscripts of

217. T. ANTONOPOULOU, Philagathos Kerameus and Emperor Leo VI : on a model of the *ecphrasis* of the Cappella Palatina in Palermo, *Nea Rhome* 12, 2015 [2016], pp. 115–27. Cf. immediately below (with n. 222), on family β of the *Special panegyricon*.

218. G. BRECCIA, “*Magis consilio quam viribus*” : Ruggero II di Sicilia e la guerra, *MEG* 3, 2003, pp. 53–68.

219. Ed. T. ANTONOPOULOU, Commenting on a homily : a poem by Manuel Philes, *Byz.* 9, 2009, pp. 25–36, esp. 29–30; also EAD., On the reception of homilies and hagiography in Byzantium : the recited metrical prefaces, in *Imitatio, Aemulatio, Variatio : Akten des internationalen wissenschaftlichen Symposiums zur byzantinischen Sprache und Literatur* (Wien, 22.–25. Oktober 2008), hrsg. von A. Rhöby & E. Schiffer (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philos.-hist. Kl. Denkschriften 402 = Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung 21), Wien 2010, pp. 57–79, esp. 74.

220. T. ANTONOPOULOU, Verses in praise of Leo VI, *Byz.* 66, 1996, pp. 281–4.

221. See, for example, the testimonies (mainly, but not exclusively, to the *Homilies*) collected in ANTONOPOULOU, *The Homilies of Leo VI* (quoted n. 12), pp. 35–6.

222. See above, p. 194 with n. 32.

family β (*AS*) of the *Special panegyricon* originate. A particularly interesting aspect of the manuscript tradition concerns two codices of *Homily 7* on the Holy Spirit, which was used as late as the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in the framework of doctrinal discussions among churches. A couple of homilies (nos. 3 and 17) were even rephrased into vernacular Greek in Ottoman times.²²³

Concerning Leo's other literary works, the *Guidance* also has a rich manuscript tradition. The incomplete list compiled by J. Grosdidier de Matons comprises sixteen manuscripts of the entire series of chapters and mentions an unspecified number of other witnesses containing extracts, of which two are named.²²⁴ Even richer is the tradition of his hymns as a whole.²²⁵ The *Eothina anastasima* were and still are the best known among them, as they entered the liturgy and are sung until today. Other hymns are also found in liturgical manuscripts and books under the name Λέοντος δεσπότου. A philological study of Leo's hymnographic oeuvre, which would explore their manuscript tradition and establish a critical text is long overdue. The *Song of compunction* was a popular work, as it is transmitted by several manuscripts from the end of the thirteenth century onwards, thirteen of which were known to the last editor. The poems on the lily are rarer, the longer one being preserved in two manuscripts and the shorter in just one. The manuscript tradition of the *Paraclete canon*, which comprises three codices, was commented on above.

Leo's *Novels* have fared much better in scholarly literature thanks to a number of editions and studies of their direct and indirect traditions, which have revealed their considerable influence on subsequent legislation.²²⁶ Whereas the collection of 113 *Novels* survives in a single Byzantine manuscript, other collections have also come down to us, in particular a popular selection of 55 abbreviated novels, which is contained in around thirty manuscripts.²²⁷ As for the *Tactica*, according to A. Dain, the treatise is the most widespread of the whole tradition of strategists.²²⁸ It has come down to us in several manuscripts of the mid-ninth to the mid-tenth centuries—the earliest being the aforementioned *Laurentianus*—, which represent distinct versions of the original

223. See the Introduction in ANTONOPOULOU, *Leonis VI Homiliae* (quoted n. 14), for a description and textual evaluation of all the manuscripts; especially, pp. civ–cv (Table I) for an overview of the twenty manuscripts of the *Panegyricon*; pp. cxxvii–cli (Tables III–VI) for the 83 manuscripts of individual homilies; pp. cvi–cvii for the *stemma codicum* of the *Panegyricon* (Table II) and the provenance of family β; and pp. cliv–clv on *Hom. 7*.

224. GROS DIDIER DE MATONS, *Trois études* (quoted n. 30), pp. 208–12. Some extra manuscripts are listed in the Pinakes database; see <http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/oeuvre/id/2965>.

225. See above, p. 202 with nn. 68, 71.

226. On the influence of the *Novels*, see Leo VI, *Nov.*, pp. 33–5 with bibliography.

227. See the overview of previous literature in Leo VI, *Nov.*, pp. 18–21, 30–6. See further L. BURGMANN, M. T. FÖGEN, A. SCHMINCK & D. SIMON, *Repertorium der Handschriften des byzantinischen Rechts. 1, Die Handschriften des weltlichen Rechts* (Nr. 1–327) (Forschungen zur byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte 20), Frankfurt am Main 1995, Index s.v. “Kaiserurkunden/ Leon VI/Novellen”; cf. also, “Prochiron” and “Basiliken”; A. SCHMINCK & D. GETOV, *Repertorium der Handschriften des byzantinischen Rechts. 2, 1, Die Handschriften des kirchlichen Rechts* (Nr. 328–427) (Forschungen zur byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte 28), Frankfurt am Main 2010, Index s.v. “Prochiron” and “Basiliken”.

228. See DAIN & FOUCault, *Les stratéistes byzantins* (quoted n. 93), p. 355.

text.²²⁹ The *Problemata*, by contrast, which is of no particular interest, survives in a single manuscript, the same *Laurentianus*.²³⁰

EPILOGUE

In Leo VI's person one encounters the combination of a deep sense of imperial duties towards the people and of accountability to the divine, broad literary knowledge and personal interest in a variety of fields, an ability to identify gaps and shortcomings in the practical/everyday and theoretical/literary spheres coupled with the willingness to invent ways to deal with them. *Anakatharsis* and *anakainisis*, cleansing and renovation, are central themes of his activity. Relevant statements are found in the case of the legislation and tactical handbook as well as in the *Funeral oration* and the *Guidance*. These themes could even be regarded as applicable to all of his writing and literary pursuits, whether legislative, military, ascetic, homiletic, hagiographical, or hymnographical. Given their early use in his writings, it appears that these ideas guided his mind from the outset of his reign. It also becomes clear, from his work, that the traditional synthesis of profane and Christian was given a new perspective and novel dynamics, with optimism for the future, especially in the first part of his reign.

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

229. For details, see the edition by DENNIS, pp. ix–xiii, as well as the chapter “Manuscripts and date” in HALDON, *A critical commentary* (quoted n. 14), pp. 55–66.

230. See DAIN & FOUCault, *Les stratégités byzantins* (quoted n. 93), p. 354.

ABRÉVIATIONS

<i>AASS</i>	<i>Acta sanctorum quotquot toto orbe colluntur, vel a catholicis scriptoribus celebrantur quae ex latinis et graecis, aliarumque gentium antiquis monumentis, colligit, digessit, notis illustravit J. Bollandus, operam et studium contulit G. Henschenius, Antuerpiae – Bruxellis 1643-1940.</i>
<i>ACO</i>	<i>Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum</i> , ed. instituit E. Schwartz, continuavit J. Straub, Berlin 1914-1940.
<i>ACO, ser. sec.</i>	<i>Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum. Series secunda</i> , ed. R. Riedinger, Berlin 1984-.
<i>Annae Comnenae Alexias</i>	<i>: Annae Comnenae Alexias</i> , rec. D. R. Reinsch et A. Kambylis (CFHB 40, 1), Berolini 2001.
<i>Annales ESC</i>	<i>Annales, économie, sociétés, civilisations</i> . Paris.
<i>AnBoll</i>	<i>Analecta Bollandiana</i> . Bruxelles.
Anne Comnène, <i>Alexiade</i>	<i>: Anne Comnène, Alexiade, règne de l'empereur Alexis I Comnène (1081-1118)</i> , texte établi et trad. par B. Leib (Collection byzantine), 4 vol., Paris 1937-1976.
<i>AnTard</i>	<i>Antiquité tardive</i> . Turnhout.
<i>ArchOr</i>	<i>Archiv Orientální</i> . Praha.
Aristakès de Lastivert, <i>Récit des malheurs de la nation arménienne</i>	, trad. française avec une introd. et commentaire par M. Canard et H. Berbérian d'après l'éd. et la trad. russe de K. Yuzbashian (Bibliothèque de <i>Byzantium</i> 5), Bruxelles 1973.
<i>BCH</i>	<i>Bulletin de correspondance hellénique</i> . Paris.
<i>BEFAR</i>	Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises de Rome et d'Athènes.
<i>BHG, BHG³</i>	<i>Bibliotheca hagiographica Graeca</i> , 3 ^e éd. mise à jour et considérablement augmentée, Bruxelles 1957.
<i>BMFD</i>	<i>Byzantine monastic foundation documents : a complete translation of the surviving founders' typika and testaments</i> , ed. by J. Thomas and A. Constantinides Hero (DOS 35), Washington DC 2000.
<i>BMGS</i>	<i>Byzantine and modern Greek studies</i> . Leeds.
Bryennios, <i>Histoire</i>	<i>: Nicéphore Bryennios, Histoire</i> , introd., texte, trad. et notes par P. Gautier (CFHB 9), Bruxelles 1975.
<i>BSA</i>	<i>The annual of the British School at Athens</i> . London.
<i>BSL</i>	<i>Byzantinoslavica : revue internationale des études byzantines</i> . Praha.
<i>Byz.</i>	<i>Byzantion : revue internationale des études byzantines</i> . Wetteren.
<i>Byz. Forsch.</i>	<i>Byzantinische Forschungen : internationale Zeitschrift für Byzantinistik</i> . Amsterdam.
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</i> . Berlin.
<i>CArch</i>	<i>Cahiers archéologiques</i> . Paris.

Autour du Premier humanisme byzantin & des Cinq études sur le xi^e siècle, quarante ans après Paul Lemerle, éd. par B. Flusin & J.-C. Cheynet (Travaux et mémoires 21/2), Paris 2017, p. IX-XVI.

CC	Corpus christianorum. Turnhout.
CCCM	Corpus christianorum. Continuatio mediaevalis. Turnhout.
CCSG	Corpus christianorum. Series Graeca. Turnhout.
CCSL	Corpus christianorum. Series Latina. Turnhout.
CEFR	Collection de l'École française de Rome. Rome.
CFHB	Corpus fontium historiae Byzantinae.
CHEYNET	<i>Pouvoir et contestations : J.-C. CHEYNET, Pouvoir et contestations à Byzance : 963-1210 (Byzantina Sorbonensis 9)</i> , Paris 1990.
CHEYNET	<i>Société : J.-C. CHEYNET, La société byzantine : l'apport des sceaux</i> (Bilans de recherche 3), Paris 2008.
CHEYNET et al.	<i>Istanbul : J.-C. CHEYNET, avec la coll. de V. BULGURLU et T. GÖKYILDIRIM, Les sceaux byzantins du musée archéologique d'Istanbul</i> , Istanbul 2012.
CHEYNET – MORRISON – SEIBT	<i>Seyrig : J.-C. CHEYNET, C. MORRISON, W. SEIBT, Les sceaux byzantins de la collection Henri Seyrig</i> , Paris 1991.
CJ	<i>Corpus iuris civilis. 2, Codex Justinianus</i> , recognovit P. Krüger, Berolini 1877.
CPG	<i>Clavis patrum Graecorum</i> . Turnhout 1974-2003.
CRAI	<i>Comptes rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres</i> . Paris.
CSCO	Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium. Louvain.
CSHB	Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae.
CTh	<i>Codex Theodosianus</i> .
DAI	Constantine Porphyrogenitus, <i>De administrando imperio</i> , Greek text ed. by Gy. Moravcsik; English transl. by R. J. H. Jenkins (CFHB 1), Washington DC 1967 ² .
DChAE	<i>Δελτίον τῆς Χριστιανικῆς ἀρχαιολογικῆς ἐταιρείας</i> . Athènes.
Dionysiou	<i>Actes de Dionysiou</i> , éd. diplomatique par N. Oikonomidès (Archives de l'Athos 4), Paris 1968.
DOC III, 1	Ph. GRIERSON, <i>Catalogue of the Byzantine coins in the Dumbarton Oaks collection and in the Whittemore collection. 3, Leo III to Nicephorus III, 717-1081. 1, Leo III to Michael III, 717-867</i> , Washington DC 1973.
DOC III, 2	Ph. GRIERSON, <i>Catalogue of the Byzantine coins in the Dumbarton Oaks collection and in the Whittemore collection. 3, Leo III to Nicephorus III, 717-1081. 2, Basil I to Nicephorus III, 867-1081</i> , Washington DC 1993.
Docheiariou	<i>Actes de Docheiariou</i> , éd. diplomatique par N. Oikonomidès (Archives de l'Athos 13), Paris 1984.
DÖLGER &	WIRTH, <i>Regesten : F. DÖLGER, P. WIRTH, Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 565-1453. 2, 1025-1204</i> , erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage, München 1995.
DOP	<i>Dumbarton Oaks papers</i> . Washington DC.
DOS	Dumbarton Oaks studies. Washington DC.
DOSeals 1-6	<i>Catalogue of Byzantine seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art. 1, Italy, North of the Balkans, North of the Black Sea</i> , ed. by J. Nesbitt and N. Oikonomides, Washington DC 1991; <i>2, South of the Balkans, the Islands, South of Asia Minor</i> , ed. by J. Nesbitt and N. Oikonomides, Washington DC 1994; <i>3, West, Northwest, and Central Asia Minor and the Orient</i> , ed. by J. Nesbitt and N. Oikonomides, Washington DC 1996; <i>4, The East</i> , ed. by E. McGeer, J. Nesbitt and N. Oikonomides, Washington DC 2001; <i>5, The East (continued)</i> ,

Constantinople and environs, unknown locations, addenda, uncertain readings, ed. by E. McGeer, J. Nesbitt and N. Oikonomides, Washington DC 2005; 6, *Emperors, patriarchs of Constantinople, addenda*, ed. by J. Nesbitt, Washington DC 2009.

DOT Dumbarton Oaks texts. Washington DC.

EEBS Ἐπετηρίς Ἐταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν σπουδῶν. Ἀθήνα.

EHB *The economic history of Byzantium : from the seventh through the fifteenth century*, A. E. Laiou, ed.-in-chief (DOS 39), Washington DC 2002 (réimpr. 2007).

EI *Encyclopédie de l'Islam*, Leiden – Paris 1913–1938.

Esphigménou *Actes d'Espigmenou*, éd. diplomatique par J. Lefort (Archives de l'Athos 6), Paris 1973.

FM 1-12 *Fontes minores*, hrsg. von D. Simon (Forschungen zur byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte), Frankfurt am Main 1976-.

GRBS *Greek, Roman and Byzantine studies*. Durham.

GRUMEL – DARROUZÈS, *Regestes : V. GRUMEL, Les regestes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople. 1, Les actes des patriarches. 3, 1043-1206*, 2^e éd. revue et corrigée par J. Darrouzès, Paris 1989.

Hommes et richesses 2 : Hommes et richesses dans l'Empire byzantin. 2, VIII^e-XV^e siècle, éd. par V. Kravari, J. Lefort et C. Morrisson (Réalités byzantines 3), Paris 1991.

IG *Inscriptiones Graecae*. Berlin 1903-.

Ioannes Mauropus, *Opera Iohannis Euchaitorum metropolitae quae in codice Vaticano Graeco 676 supersunt*, ed. P. de Lagarde (Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen 28), Göttingen 1882.

Ioannes Mauropus, *Ep. The letters of Ioannes Mauropus metropolitan of Euchaita*, Greek text, transl., and commentary by A. Karpozilos (CFHB 34), Thessalonike 1990.

IRAIK *Известия Русского археологического института в Константинополе*. Одесса, София.

Iviron 1-2 *Actes d'Iviron. 1, Des origines au milieu du XI^e siècle*, éd. diplomatique par J. Lefort, N. Oikonomidès, D. Papachryssanthou, avec la collab. de H. Métrévéli (Archives de l'Athos 14), Paris 1985.
Actes d'Iviron. 2, Du milieu du XII^e siècle à 1204, éd. diplomatique par J. Lefort, N. Oikonomidès, D. Papachryssanthou, avec la collab. de V. Kravari et de H. Métrévéli (Archives de l'Athos 16), Paris 1990.

JANIN, *Géographie 1, 3 : R. JANIN, La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin. 1, Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat œcuménique. 3, Les églises et les monastères*, Paris 1953, 1969².

JANIN, *Géographie 2 : R. JANIN, Géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin. 2, Les églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins (Bithynie, Hellespont, Latros, Galésios, Trébizonde, Athènes, Thessalonique)*, Paris 1975.

JGR *Jus Graecoromanum*, cur. J. et P. Zepos, Athenis 1931.

JHS *The journal of Hellenic studies*. London.

JÖB *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik*. Wien.

JRS *The journal of Roman studies*. London.

Kekaumenos *Cecaumeni Strategicon et incerti scriptoris De officiis regiis libellus*, ed. B. Wassiliewsky, V. K. Jernstedt, Petropoli 1896.
Советы и рассказы Кекавмена : сочинение византийского полководца XI века, подгот. текста, введ., пер. и comment. Г. Г. Литаврин [G. G. Litavrin], Москва 1972.

Kekavasenos, Στρατηγικόν, εισαγωγή, μετάφραση, σχόλια Δ. Τσουγκαράκης [D. Tsougkarakis], Αθήνα 1996.

Kekaumenos, *Consilia et Narrationes*, English transl. by Ch. Roueché (Sharing ancient wisdoms 2013), <http://www.ancientwisdoms.ac.uk/folioscope/greekLit%3Atlg3017.Syno298.sawsEng01>.

Kinnamos *Ioannis Cinnami Epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum*, rec. A. Meineke (CSHB), Bonnae 1836.

LAMPE *Greek patristic lexicon*, ed. by G. W. H. Lampe, Oxford 1961.

LAURENT, *Corpus 2 et 5* : V. LAURENT, *Le corpus des sceaux de l'Empire byzantin. 2, L'administration centrale*, Paris 1981.

V. LAURENT, *Le corpus des sceaux de l'Empire byzantin. 5, L'Église. 1-3*, Paris 1963-1972.

Lavra 1 *Actes de Lavra. 1, Des origines à 1204*, éd. diplomatique par P. Lemerle, A. Guillou, N. Svoronos, avec la collab. de D. Papachryssanthou (Archives de l'Athos 5), Paris 1970.

LEMERLE, *Cinq études* : P. LEMERLE, *Cinq études sur le xi^e siècle byzantin (1025-1118)*, Paris 1977.

LEMERLE, *Premier humanisme* : P. LEMERLE, *Le premier humanisme byzantin : notes et remarques sur enseignement et culture à Byzance des origines au x^e siècle* (Bibliothèque byzantine, Études 6), Paris 1971.

Leo Diaconus *Leonis Diaconi caloensis Historiae libri decem ; Liber de velitatione bellica Nicephori Augusti*, e rec. C. B. Hasii; accedunt *Theodosii acroases de Creta capta* e rec. F. Jacobsii et *Luitprandi legatio cum aliis libellis qui Nicephori Phocae et Joannis Tzimiscius Historiam illustrant* (CSHB 11), Bonnae 1828.

Leo VI, Nov. *Oι Νεαρές Λέοντος Σ' του Σοφού, προλεγόμενα, κείμενο, απόδοση στη νεοελληνική, ευρετήρια και επίμετρο*, Σ. Ν. Τρωϊάνος [ed. S. N. Troianos], Αθήνα 2007.

Leo VI, *Taktika* : *The Taktika of Leo VI*, text, transl. and commentary by G. T. Dennis (CFHB 49), Washington DC 2010, 2014².

LSJ (& Rev. suppl.) : *A Greek-English lexicon with a revised supplement*, comp. by H. G. Liddell & R. Scott, rev. and augm. throughout by H. S. Jones, Oxford 1996.

Matthieu d'Édesse : *Chronique de Matthieu d'Édesse (962-1136) avec la continuation de Grégoire le Prêtre jusqu'en 1162 : d'après 3 manuscrits de la Bibliothèque impériale de Paris*, [ed. É. Dulaurier] (Bibliothèque historique arménienne), Paris 1858.

MANSI *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, J. D. Mansi evulgavit, Florentiae – Venetiis 1759-1798 [réimpr. Paris 1901 et Graz 1960].

MB 1- *Μεσαιωνικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη ἡ Συλλογὴ ἀνεκδότων μνημείων τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἱστορίας, ἐπιστασία K. N. Σαθα* [éd. K. N. Sathas], Βενετία 1872-1894.

MEFRM *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Moyen Âge*. Rome – Paris.

MEG *Medioevo greco : rivista di storia e filologia bizantina*. Alessandria.

MGH *Monumenta Germaniae historica*. Berlin. SS : Scriptores. Ep. : Epistolae.

Michael Attaliates, *The history* : Michael Attaliates, *The history*, transl. by A. Kaldellis and D. Krallis (Dumbarton Oaks medieval library 16), Cambridge 2012.

Michaelis Attaliatae Historia : *Michaelis Attaliatae Historia*, rec. E. Th. Tsolakis (CFHB 50), Athenis 2011.

Miguel Ataliates, *Historia* Miguel Ataliates, *Historia*, introd., ed., trad. y commentario de I. Pérez Martín (Nueva Roma 15), Madrid 2002.

Michel le Syrien *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, patriarche jacobite d'Antioche (1166-1199)*, éd. et trad. par J.-B. Chabot, 1, *Traduction livres I-VII*; 2, *Traduction livres VIII-XI*; 3, *Traduction livres XII-XXI*; 4, *Texte syriaque*, Paris 1899-1924 (réimpr. Bruxelles 1963).

MIFAO Mémoires publiés par les membres de l’Institut français d’archéologie orientale du Caire. Le Caire.

MM 1-6 *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana collecta*, ed. F. Miklosich et J. Müller, 6 vol., Vindobonae 1860-1890, réimpr. Aalen 1968.

MTM Monographies de *Travaux et mémoires*. Paris.

Nicetas Choniates, *Historia : Nicetae Choniatae Historia*, rec. I. A. van Dieten (CFHB 11), Berolini – Novi Eboraci 1975.

OCA *Orientalia Christiana analecta*. Roma.

OCP *Orientalia Christiana periodica : commentarii de re orientali aetatis christiana sacra et profana*. Roma.

ODB *Oxford dictionary of Byzantium*, A. P. Kazhdan ed. in chief, New York 1991.

OIKONOMIDÈS, *Fiscalité* : N. OIKONOMIDÈS, *Fiscalité et exemption fiscale à Byzance (IX^e-XI^e s.)* (Fondation nationale de la recherche scientifique. Institut de recherches byzantines. Monographies 2), Athènes 1996.

OIKONOMIDÈS, *Listes* : N. OIKONOMIDÈS, *Les listes de présence byzantines des IX^e et X^e siècles : introduction, texte, traduction et commentaire* (Le monde byzantin 4), Paris 1972.

OLA *Orientalia Lovaniensia analecta*. Louvain.

Pantélèmōn Actes de Saint-Pantélèmōn, éd. diplomatique par P. Lemerle, G. Dagron, S. Ćircović (Archives de l’Athos 12), Paris 1982.

Patmos 1-2 *Buζαντινὰ ἔγγραφα τῆς μονῆς Πάτμου. A'*, Αύτοκρατορικά, γενική εισαγωγή, ευρετήρια, πίνακες υπό Ε. Λ. Βρανούση [ed. E. L. Vranousse] (Εθνικό Τδρυμα ερευνών. Κέντρο Βυζαντινών ερευνών), Αθήνα 1980.
Buζαντινὰ ἔγγραφα τῆς μονῆς Πάτμου. B', Δημοσίων λειτουργῶν, διπλωματική ἔκδ. M. Νυσταζοπούλου-Πελεκίδου [ed. M. Nystazopoulou-Pelekidou] (Εθνικό Τδρυμα ερευνών. Κέντρο Βυζαντινών ερευνών), Αθήνα 1980.

PBW M. JEFFREYS et al., *Prosopography of the Byzantine world*, <<http://pbw.kcl.ac.uk>>

Peira Πείρα ἥγουν διδασκαλία ἐκ τῶν πράξεων τοῦ μεγάλου κυροῦ Εὐσταθίου τοῦ Ρωμαίου = *JGR. 4, Practica ex actis Eustathii Romani : epitome legum*, ex ed. C. E. Zachariae a Lingenthal, ἐπιψ. Ι. Δ. Ζέπου, Athenis 1931.

PG *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca*, accur. J.-P. Migne, Paris 1856-1866.

Photius, *Bibliothèque* : Photius, *Bibliothèque*. 1-8, texte établi et trad. par R. Henry, Paris 1959-1977.

Photius, *Epistulae et Amphilochia* : Photii Patriarchae Constantinopolitani *Epistulae et Amphilochia*. 1-6, rec. B. Laourdas et L. G. Westerink (Teubner), Leipzig 1983-1988.

PmbZ *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit*, nach Vorarbeiten F. Winkelmanns erstellt von R.-J. Lilie et al., Berlin 1998-2000.

PO *Patrologia Orientalis*. Paris.

Prôtaton *Actes du Prôtaton*, éd. diplomatique par D. Papachryssanthou (Archives de l’Athos 7), Paris 1975.

Psellos, *Chronographia : Michaelis Pselli Chronographia*, hrsg. von D. R. Reinsch (Millennium-Studien 51), Berlin 2014.

Psellos, *Chronographie* : Michel Psellos, *Chronographie ou Histoire d'un siècle de Byzance* : (976-1077), texte établi et trad. par É. Renauld (Les Belles Lettres. Collection byzantine), Paris 1926-1928.

Psellos, *Ep.* *Michaelis Pselli scripta minora magnam partem adhuc inedita. 2, Epistulae*, ed. recognovitque E. Kurtz ex schedis eius relictis in lucem emisit F. Drexel (Orbis Romanus. Biblioteca di testi medievali 12), Milano 1941.

Psellos, *Historia syntomos* : *Michaelis Pselli Historia syntomos*, rec., Anglice vertit et commentario instruxit W. J. Aerts (CFHB 30), Berolini 1990.

Psellos, *Or.* *Michaelis Pselli Orationes panegyricae*, ed. G. T. Dennis, Lipsiæ 1994.

Ps.-Symeon Magister : *Theophanes continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus*, ex rec. I. Bekkeri (CSHB 31), Bonnae 1838, p. 601-760.

RALLÈS – POTLÈS 1-6 : Σύντομα τῶν θείων καὶ ἱερῶν κανόνων, ὑπὸ Γ. Α. Πάλλη καὶ Μ. Πιοτλῆ, ἐν Ἀθήναις 1852-1859.

RE *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Stuttgart – München 1894-1997.

REArm *Revue des études arméniennes*. Paris.

REB *Revue des études byzantines*. Paris.

REG *Revue des études grecques*. Paris.

RbK *Reallexikon zur byzantinischen Kunst*, begr. von K. Wessel und M. Restle, hrsg. von K. Wessel, Stuttgart 1966-.

RHT *Revue d'histoire des textes*. Turnhout.

RN *Revue numismatique*. Paris.

RSBN *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici*. Roma.

SBS *Studies in Byzantine sigillography*.

SC Sources chrétiennes. Paris.

Scylitzes *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum*, rec. I. Thurn (CFHB. Series Berolinensis 5), Berlin – New York 1973.

Scylitzes continuatus dans Georgius Cedrenus : *Georgius Cedrenus Ioannis Scylitzae ope*, ab I. Bekkeri suppletus et emendatus (CSHB 4), Bonnae 1838-1839, vol. 2, p. 641-744.

Scylitzes continuatus : *Ἡ συνέχεια τῆς Χρονογραφίας τοῦ Ἰωάννου Σκυλίτση (Ioannes Skylitzes Continuatus)*, εκδ. E. Θ. Τσολάκης [E. Th. Tsolakis] ('Ιδρυμα μελετῶν Ξερσονίσου τοῦ Αἴμου 105), Θεσσαλονίκη 1968.

Skylitzès, *Empereurs* : Jean Skylitzès, *Empereurs de Constantinople*, texte trad. par B. Flusin et annoté par J.-C. Cheynet (Réalités byzantines 8), Paris 2003.

SVORONOS, Remarques : N. SVORONOS, Remarques sur les structures économiques de l'Empire byzantin au xi^e siècle, *TM* 6, 1976, p. 49-67.

Symeon Magister, *Chronicon* : *Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon*, rec. S. Wahlgren (CFHB 44, 1), Berolini – Novi Eboraci 2006.

Syn. CP *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae e codice Sirmondiano nunc Berolinensi, adiectis synaxariis selectis, Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Novembris*, éd. H. Delehaye, Bruxelles 1902 [réimpr. Louvain 1954].

Teubner Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana.

Theophanes *Theophanis Chronographia*, rec. C. de Boor (Teubner), Lipsiae 1883-1885 [réimpr. Hildesheim – New York 1980].

Theophanes continuatus : *Theophanes continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus*, ex rec. I. Bekkeri (CSHB 31), Bonnae 1838.

Theophanes continuatus, ed. Featherstone – Signes : *Chronographiae quae Theophanis Continuati nomine fertur libri I-IV*, rec., anglice verterunt, indicibus instruxerunt M. Featherstone et J. Signes-Codoñer, nuper repertis schedis C. de Boor adiuvantibus (CFHB 53), Boston – Berlin 2015.

Théophylacte, *Lettres* : Théophylacte d'Achrida, *Lettres*, introd., texte, trad. et notes par P. Gautier (CFHB 16, 2), Thessalonique 1986.

TIB *Tabula Imperii Byzantini*. Wien.
TIB 2 : F. HILD & M. RESTLE, *Kappadokien (Kappadokia, Charsianon, Sebasteia und Lykandos)*, Wien 1981.
TIB 7 : K. BELKE & N. MERSICH, *Phrygien und Pisidien*, Wien 1990.
TIB 13 : K. BELKE, *Bithynia und Hellespontos*, en préparation.
TIB 15 : K.-P. TODT & B. A. VEST, *Syria (Syria Prōtē, Syria Deutera, Syria Euphratēsia)*, 3 vol., Wien 2014.

Timarion Pseudo-Luciano, *Timarione*, testo critico, introd., trad., commentario e lessico a cura di R. Romano (Byzantina et Neo-hellenica Neapolitana 2), Napoli 1974.

TLG Thesaurus linguae Graecae.

TM *Travaux & mémoires*. Paris.

TRAPP, *Lexikon* : *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität besonders des 9.-12. Jahrhunderts*, erstellt von E. Trapp, Wien 1994-.

Typikon de Grégoire Pakourianos : éd. P. GAUTIER, Le typikon du sébaste Grégoire Pakourianos, *REB* 42, 1984, p. 5-145.

Variorum CS Variorum collected studies series. London – Aldershot.

Vatopédi 1, 3 *Actes de Vatopédi. 1, Des origines à 1329*, éd. diplomatique par J. Bompaire, J. Lefort, V. Kravari, C. Giros (Archives de l'Athos 21), Paris 2001.
Actes de Vatopédi. 3, De 1377 à 1500, éd. diplomatique par J. Lefort, Ch. Giros, V. Kravari, K. Smyrlis, R. Estangüi Gómez (Archives de l'Athos 23), Paris sous presse.

Villages dans l'Empire : *Les villages dans l'Empire byzantin, IV^e-XV^e siècle*, éd. par J. Lefort, C. Morrisson et J.-P. Sodini (Réalités byzantines 11), Paris 2005.

Vita Basilii *Chronographiae quae Theophanis Continuati nomine fertur liber quo Vita Basilii imperatoris amplectitur*, rec. Anglice vertit indicibus instruxit I. Ševčenko nuper repertus schedis C. de Boor adiuvantibus (CFHB 42), Berlin 2011.

Vita Euthymii *Vita Euthymii patriarchae CP*, text, transl., introd. and commentary by P. Karlin-Hayter (Bibliothèque de Byzantion 3), Bruxelles 1971.

Vita Ignatii (BHG 817) Nicetas David, *The life of Patriarch Ignatius*, text and transl. by A. Smithies, with notes by J. M. Duffy (CFHB 51 – DOT 13), Washington DC 2013.

VV *Византийский временник*. Москва.

WBS Wiener byzantinistische Studien. Wien.

WILSON, *Scholars* : N. G. WILSON, *Scholars of Byzantium*, London – Cambridge Mass. 1996² [1983].

Xénophon *Actes de Xénophon*, éd. diplomatique par D. Papachryssanthou (Archives de l'Athos 15), Paris 1986.

Xèropotamou *Actes de Xèropotamou*, éd. diplomatique par J. Bompaire (Archives de l'Athos 3), Paris 1964.

ZACOS 2 G. ZACOS, *Byzantine lead seals. 2*, compiled and ed. by J. W. Nesbitt, Berne 1984-1985.

Zonaras *Ioannis Zonarae Epitomae historiarum. 3, Libri 13-18*, ed. T. Büttner-Wobst ex rec. M. Pinderi (CSHB), Bonnae 1897.

ZPE *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*. Bonn.

ZRVI *Зборник радова Византологичког института*. Београд.

ABSTRACTS/RÉSUMÉS

Luisa ANDRIOLLO & Sophie MÉTIVIER, *Quel rôle pour les provinces dans la domination aristocratique au XI^e siècle?*

p. 505

Although he has drawn famous portraits of Byzantine aristocrats in a number of studies, Paul Lemerle did not explicitly address the relation with the provincial territories as an important factor in creating a Byzantine aristocratic identity. The issue was first explicitly raised by Hélène Ahrweiler, who pointed to the progressive detachment of Byzantine aristocrats from their provincial bases during the eleventh century and to their subsequent “Constantinopolisation.” In later years, scholars, such as Jean-Claude Cheynet, Alexander Kazhdan and John Haldon, have further scrutinized the importance of provincial bonds as a source of social power and political influence.

The authors of this paper provide a fresh look at long-debated questions by reconsidering Byzantine aristocratic attitude toward the eastern regions of the empire on the eve of the Turkish invasions. Evidence related to the physical presence of prominent individuals and families in the eastern provinces has been collected in an updated prosopographic table, which takes into account both the ownership of properties and the performance of public functions in Asia Minor. The interpretation of the available sources sheds new light on a complex network of relations connecting the elites in the capital and a stratified provincial society. The symbolic power of provincial family memory is also examined through the prism of hagiographic literature. The Lives of Dositheos the Young and of Niketas Patrikios showcase the alleged provincial connections of two important lineages, the Genesioi and the Monomachoi, and point to their implications for family prestige and social legitimacy.

Theodora ANTONOPOULOU, *Emperor Leo VI the Wise and the “First Byzantine humanism”:
On the quest for renovation and cultural synthesis*

p. 187

The study offers a comprehensive re-evaluation of the literary personality and works of the emperor-author Leo VI the Wise. Although he nowadays emerges as a pivotal figure in the revival of letters of the ninth and tenth centuries, Leo is nearly absent from P. Lemerle’s classic book on the “First Byzantine humanism.” After suggesting an explanation for this apparent paradox and briefly reviewing subsequent scholarship on the emperor, the present author, building on her previous work, attempts to disprove the hesitance with which Leo is still approached when it comes to his literary output, and to highlight those issues which indicate and stress two themes that run through it: renovation and cultural synthesis. In particular, the article examines the following issues: Leo’s culture, classical and Christian, on the basis of mainly internal evidence; his hagiographical metaphrases and other works to which rewriting and reworking applied and which reveal his realization of the need for literary and cultural renovation and the ways in which he dealt with it; certain aspects of his personality as traced mostly, but not exclusively, in his own works; his role as a “Christian humanist” within the cultural phenomenon of the “First Byzantine humanism”; and, finally, some remarks on the influence his literary works exercised, as illustrated by their Byzantine reception. An epilogue sums up the results of this investigation, which underlines the emperor’s significant literary achievement and contribution to the revival of his time.

Isabelle AUGÉ, *Les Arméniens et l'Empire byzantin (1025-1118)*

p. 789

The Byzantine Empire has seen numerous migrations of Armenians and maintained long standing relations with Armenia. The conquest of its territory in the 11th century enhances the flow of migrants. The first part of this article attempts to present the role of the Armenians—active or passive parties—in the conduct of events of the empire's oriental border in the years 1025–1118. While the territories of the northeast are annexed and placed under direct Byzantine administration, Armenians participate in the defense against the Seljuk Turks in the region of Antioch. The key figure here is Philaretos Brachamios. The second part of this article focuses on the Armenian communities within the Byzantine Empire, in terms of location and numbers. The sources are varied but concentrate on the aristocracy, leaving in the dark lower social ranks. Finally, this article presents religious disagreements in matters of faith, which are always underlined by sources. The emperors and the ecclesiastical hierarchy try, more or less, to convert all the Armenians to the Chalcedonian faith.

Dominique BARTHÉLEMY, *L'aristocratie franque du xi^e siècle en contraste avec l'aristocratie byzantine*

p. 491

In the eleventh century, the aristocracy of the Byzantine Empire, considered as a whole or in part, has sometimes been called “feudal” by assimilation with that of Western Europe during the same period. A comparative study may reveal some analogies, but the inventory of differences seems even more interesting: the ways of combining birth and merit or of fighting social ascensions of subordinates differ widely, and in feudal France, or even elsewhere in the West, there are a series of codes which oblige kings and princes to use a great deal of clemency towards their “rebel” vassals, and when the latter are fighting each other, they treat each other with some sort of respect, from which classical chivalry rises around 1100.

Béatrice CASEAU & Marie-Christine FAYANT, *Le renouveau du culte des stylites syriens aux x^e et xi^e siècles? La Vie abrégée de Syméon Stylite le Jeune (BHG 1691c)*

p. 701

The article offers an analysis of the 10th century Byzantine reconquest's impact on the two Symeon Stylites monasteries in northern Syria. The two saints share many characteristics besides their common name and their two monasteries were in competition since the end of late antiquity, but Symeon Stylites the Younger monastery located on the Wondrous Mountain, close to Antioch gained an advantage from being in relatively close proximity with the ruling elites sent from Constantinople, where one also notes a renewed interest for the two Syrian saints. In the early 11th century, Symeon Stylite the Younger monastery has become an economically prosperous and intellectually very lively center. It is a place of writing and translations of hagiographic texts. The ancient *Life* of the saint is either paraphrased or abridged. The authors analyze what is considered worthy to be mentioned in the middle Byzantine short versions of the saint's Life and the interest of these choices for the historian. A translation of this abridged *Life of Symeon Stylite the Younger (BHG 1691c)* is proposed by M.-Ch. Fayant.

Reinhart CEULEMANS & Peter VAN DEUN, *Réflexions sur la littérature anthologique de Constantin V à Constantin VII*

p. 361

This article surveys and reflects upon compilation activities from the 8th to the 10th century. Attention is paid to spiritual florilegia as well as to the influence of the monumental compilation ascribed to John Damascene. An appendix focuses on the ending of one of the anthologies treated in the article, the so-called *Coislin Florilegium*.

Jean-Claude CHEYNET, *La société urbaine*

p. 449

Studies on Byzantine society have multiplied over the last forty years, renewed by the contribution of archeology and even more of sigillography. Many unknown seals have been published and old editions have been corrected and seals better dated. As a result, the aristocracy remains the most studied social

group. While Constantinople is still the vital center of the Empire, the rise of provincial cities, notably Antioch, Edessa, Melitene, Adrianople and Thessalonica, has highlighted the local elites whose relations with the capital have largely determined the fate of the Empire. The “Queen of Cities” itself has a mix of “ethnicities,” a diversification of civil and military functions within the most important families, and an increase in the number of literate officials who worked in the administrations and entered the Senate with the consent of emperors concerned with their popularity in the capital. The coming to power of Alexis Comnenus changed much less these transformations than the upheavals engendered by the invasion of Asia Minor by the Turks. Of all these works published since the fundamental studies of P. Lemerle, the result is a less pessimistic view of the eleventh century which, without the enemy incursions in both European and Asian provinces, would have witnessed a strengthening of the economy and a greater cohesion of society.

Muriel DEBIÉ, « *La science est commune* » : sources syriaques et culture grecque en Syrie-Mésopotamie et en Perse par-delà les siècles obscurs byzantins p. 87

Along the lines of a reappraisal of the so-called Byzantine “Dark Ages,” this contribution addresses the question of the re-emergence of classical culture in Byzantium in the 9th century and how Syriac sources can throw some light on the continuation and yet transformation of late antique teaching and scholasticism. The continuous work by Syriac scholars on Greek scientific and philosophical texts in the 7th–10th centuries shows the availability of Greek manuscripts in the East, even beyond the Roman-Sasanian border. Syriac literature can help understand the transformation of Hellenism and the constitution of a cultural koine in other languages than Greek. A Christian as well as more specifically Syrian Hellenism blended the cultural idioms of Greek and “oriental” culture. Not only did Greek culture survive, but it spread in the Arabic polity and ultimately re-emerged in Byzantium from the shelves of the Byzantine libraries. Oblivion of classical “pagan” literature was parallel to the transmission of a new canonised knowledge in Syriac and then Arabic but was ultimately reversed: not so much thanks to the “return” of Greek manuscripts and texts from the East however as from a competition over the appropriation of ancient Greek culture beyond Christianity.

Stéphanos EFTHYMIADIS, *De Taraise à Méthode (787-847) : l'apport des premières grandes figures, une nouvelle approche* p. 165

This study is a response to, and update of, chapter 5 of Paul Lemerle's *Premier humanisme*, which covers the period between the Seventh Ecumenical Council of Nicaea (787) and the restoration of the veneration of icons (843). Taking into account scholarly surveys as well as editions and studies of texts that have appeared in recent decades, it revalues those generations of the Byzantine literati, whether active in the patriarchal or the monastic milieu. It shows that, as a result of such concurrent factors as pursuing an education shared by iconoclasts and iconodules alike or an expanded care for copying books, Byzantium had experienced a cultural revival already by the beginning of the ninth century. This revival, however, must be measured and interpreted with the standards and priorities of Byzantine society and not those of the classical world.

Raúl ESTANGÜI GÓMEZ & Michel KAPLAN, *La société rurale au XI^e siècle : une réévaluation* p. 531

Since the *Cinq études sur le XI^e siècle byzantin* by Paul Lemerle (1977), the way in which the Byzantine empire countryside and its rural economy have been interpreted has evolved. Studies over the past two decades have shown that, far from being a cause of “blocking,” the growth of the large estate has favored growth, thanks to the ability of large landowners to invest. One notes the same trend in Byzantium as in the rest of Europe and the Mediterranean world. However, too great a role was accorded to the domanial framework, at the expense of the role played by the village society, which remained relatively rich and dynamic and seemed co-responsible for the economic take-off of the Byzantine countryside at that time.

The documents in the Athonite archives show a highly mobile rural society, taking part in the dynamic of growth, where peasants working on a large estate become members of a village community, improving their legal and social status. It would appear that after a period of crisis in village societies in the 10th century, changes in taxation (the end of village solidarity, the introduction of a personal tax) enabled the peasantry to improve its situation and benefit from the economic growth of the Byzantine Empire, of which the eleventh century is a strong moment, and which continues at an even faster pace in the following century.

Bernard FLUSIN, *Arethas de Césarée et la transmission du savoir*

p. 309

Paul Lemerle dedicates a chapter in his book on the “First Byzantine humanism” to “Arethas of Patras,” and while he judges unfavorably the person, he dwells on the exceptional interest of his case. Here we seek to show that Arethas, far from being a mere bibliophile, played a crucial role in the transmission of knowledge, as a teacher and also because of his awareness of the stakes involved in the copying of books. The knowledge he transmitted was to a large extent pagan, yet revised and sorted out, as was often the case in late antiquity, in the light of Christianity.

Valérie FROMENTIN, *La mémoire de l'histoire : la tradition antique, tardo-antique et byzantine des historiens grecs, V^e siècle avant-X^e siècle après J.-C.*

p. 339

This paper aims to reassess the role played by the “first Byzantine Renaissance” in the textual transmission of Greek (pre-Christian) historians. It seeks to demonstrate against the current prevailing point of view that the making of the *Excerpta Constantiniana* did not prevent the integral works from being copied simultaneously, from either private or imperial initiatives, the two undertakings (excerpting fragments, editing complete *Histories*) both having helped preserve this textual heritage.

Andreas GKOUTZIOUKOSTAS, *Administrative structures of Byzantium during the 11th century: officials of the imperial secretariat and administration of justice*

p. 561

In this paper traditional and modern research views concerning officials of the 11th century who belonged to (e.g. *protoasecretis*) or are assumed by scholars to be associated with the imperial secretariat (e.g. *mystikos*) and who are known (e.g. *droungarios of the vigla*, *kritai of the velum* and *kritai of the hippodrome*) or thought to have been judicial officers (e.g. *mystographos*, *mystolektes*, *thesmophylax*, *thesmographos*, *exaktor*, *kensor* and *praitor*) are approached critically, and some new interpretations and suggestions based on the information of the primary sources and the conclusions of our research over the past decade are proposed.

John HALDON, *L'armée au XI^e siècle : quelques questions et quelques problèmes*

p. 581

It is generally assumed that the defeat of the imperial army under Romanos IV at the battle of Mantzikert in 1071 was the result of a combination of several factors, including a long-term decline in military effectiveness within the empire, reflected in the demobilisation of provincial thematic forces, on the one hand, and the government's reliance on foreign mercenary soldiers, on the other; and the incompetence or poor leadership of military commanders, including the emperor Romanos IV himself. While these reasons reflect the tendencies and agendas of the sources, this paper will question some of the assumptions underlying them, and propose rather that the empire's armies continued to be effective, coherent and disciplined for much of this time, and that Romanos IV was a competent and able strategist. The picture that currently prevails is far from entirely inaccurate, but there is no doubt that some assumptions can be challenged and that greater precision can be achieved in certain respects.

James HOWARD-JOHNSTON, *Procès aristocratiques de la Peira*

p. 483

Roughly a quarter of the judgements and opinions collected in the *Peira* by an admirer of Eustathius Romaios, a high court judge of the early eleventh century, concern the aristocracy. The selection of criminal cases (picked out because of the points of law they raised) reveals the seamy side of the exercise of power by the “powerful,” their use of retinues to prey upon their inferiors and the “poor” (or worse). Civil suits concerning inheritance, debts and dowries cast light on the households, wealth and attitudes of what was evidently a ruling class, conscious of its status. What is most striking is the commitment of the courts to the upholding of the law, even when it went against the interests of the “powerful.” The convictions of several members of the powerful family of the Skleroi are highlighted in the text, as are the occasions when higher courts overruled the judgments of lower courts where they had been swayed by local influence. It looks as if the justice system was successfully defending the traditional, peasant-based social order of Byzantium in the first half of the eleventh century.

David JACOBY, *Byzantine maritime trade, 1025–1118*

p. 627

Despite its importance for the empire’s economy, maritime trade has not been the subject of a recent synthesis. It benefited from the general dynamism of the Byzantine economy, which raised the standard of living of the urban population. The Greeks were largely engaged in these activities, not only in the very active cabotage, long underestimated, but also in the distant trade. The Black Sea, where one of the spice routes ended up until the beginning of the eleventh century, remained a preserve. Then the Byzantine merchants supplied themselves with spices in Fatimid Egypt, where they sold silks and wood. The ships occasionally carried more and more pilgrims to the Holy Land. Amalfi and Venice were engaged in trade with the empire, which had already largely opened its ports before 1082, but their impact was rather modest and the treaty of 1082 effects were only slowly felt.

Johannes KODER, *Remarks on trade and economy in eleventh-century Asia Minor: an approach*

p. 649

The territorial reconquest in the East since the end of the 9th century was important for a temporary economic and demographic stabilization in central and western Asia Minor in the 10th and the first half of 11th century. Remarkable are the structural changes of political and economic power, in part to be explained with the dominance of the new land owning aristocracy, which on the other hand was conducive for the loss of a great part of Asia Minor in the decade after 1071. This paper discusses aspects of the general conditions of economy, traffic and settlement structures, with reference to the western part of Asia Minor, where the settlement density was relatively high.

The proximity to Constantinople strengthened the economy and the transregional trade, in particular along the coastal regions and in the harbour towns, which had reduced agricultural functions, but served as seaports for the provisions, which came from the extended hinterland to be shipped to the capital. During the two centuries of prosperity, this territory of some 200,000 km² may have had some 3 million inhabitants. The major part of them lived not in the fifty (or a little more) cities, but in rural settlements, in villages, as independent farmers or as *paroikoi*. This landscape had a fully developed economy and was densely populated, but not “urbanized.”

Dimitris KRALLIS, *Historians, politics, and the polis in the eleventh and twelfth centuries* p. 419

By tracing the elusive image of the Byzantine city in the work of historians who wrote in the period from the tenth to the thirteenth centuries, this paper outlines the place of urban centres in the politics of the Medieval Roman polity. Off-hand references and small vignettes are all the reader usually gets in Byzantine histories when it comes to the empire’s urban centres. And yet, however limited, such information gathered on the actions and opinions of urban populations and their leaders allow for the reconstruction of a world where cities, large and small, rise up as active political agents. Cities are therefore by no means politically passive in Byzantium. Their populations are accustomed to making

choices in the context of internal political rivalries and rebellions, while regularly negotiating with imperial authority in order better to serve their interests. On occasion, concern for their city's well being even forced urban populations into deals with the empire's political enemies. Approached from this perspective the work of Byzantine historians, though normally focused on war, statecraft and the actions of emperors, reveals when carefully read, a world of urban agency and political activity. As recent scholarly work has once more directed our attention to Byzantium's living, breathing body politic, the empire's cities can emerge from the pages of medieval histories and chronicles as loci for the articulation of vibrant politics.

Margherita LOSACCO, *Photius, la Bibliothèque, et au-delà : l'état de la recherche, l'usage des classiques et les préfaces du corpus*

p. 235

This article is divided into four parts. The first one (I. Biography and books: general considerations) provides a selected literature survey regarding Photius' biography, along with a brief mention of the books which allegedly belonged to his personal library. The second one (II. Photius' corpus, a memorial of books of other writers: history of the printed editions, translations, and commentaries) focuses on the editorial history of Photius' main works, before and after 1974, that is to say, before and after the publication of Lemerle's *Premier humanisme* (respectively, sections II.1 and II.2). A sub-section is devoted to the issue of Photius' classical quotations in his *Letters* and *Amphilochia*, with an examination of three case-studies (II.2.2). The editorial history of Photius' *Library*, and a general survey of the relevant philological issues, will be the object of an independent section (II.3). The third part (III. Ἀρχαιολογία of Photius' *Library*) recalls the much-debated questions regarding the composition and the chronology of the *Library* and its preface, the so-called *Letter to Tarasius*. The fourth part (IV. Photius' prefaces: beyond his *Library*) provides a commentary on Photius' prefaces to: *Against the Manichaeans* (IV.1), with a note on the chronology of its fourth book (IV.1.2) and a survey of the *topoi* of this preface (IV.1.3); *Amphilochia* (IV.2); *Lexicon* (IV.3); *Mystagogia* (IV.4); the *Letter to Tarasius* is considered in the broader context of the other prefaces (IV.5). An intertextual reading of Photius' prefaces is therefore suggested (IV.6), both within Photius' work and in the long-lasting perspective of the "topics of the exordium" (Curtius). In conclusion (IV.7), it is suggested that Photius' prefaces shape a narrative frame around its huge, composite, and often untidy works, in order to give them a more profound and consistent unity.

Paul MAGDALINO, *Humanisme et mécénat impérial aux IX^e-X^e siècles*

p. 3

This article is concerned with the social dynamics of the written production that Paul Lemerle characterised as the first Byzantine humanism. It considers the role of patronage from the top, as compared with peer complicity and competition among writers, in stimulating literary activity in non-religious genres. Although the last phase of Greek classicism in antiquity, in the early 7th century, had been shaped by imperial and patriarchal patronage, the revival of high-style literature from the end of the eighth century was initially more diffuse. During the ninth century the patriarchs overshadowed the emperors as the leading sponsors of literature, but the exceptional figure of Photius dominated the scene as much by his own output as by his patronage of other writers. The same was true of his pupil Leo VI, with whom imperial sponsorship took the lead: the literature that appeared under Leo's name was more voluminous than the works explicitly written for him. The notion—or fiction—of imperial authorship was maintained under Leo's son Constantine VII, but at the same time Constantine appears more clearly as the patron of "encyclopaedic" projects executed by others, as well as the addressee of encomiastic rhetoric. After Constantine's death (959), his projects and cultural style were continued for a generation by the quasi-imperial "prime minister" Basil the Parakoimomenos. However, Basil's removal from power in 985 revealed the fragility of imperial patronage, and suggests that this was not indispensable for the existence of Byzantine humanism.

Jean-Pierre MAHÉ, *L'âge obscur de la science byzantine et les traductions arméniennes hellénisantes vers 570-730*

p. 75

Paul Lemerle had rightly assumed that the Armenian “hellenizing” translations of the liberal arts shed light on the so-called obscure age of Byzantine science. In 1982 Abraham Terian showed that most of these translations were made between 570 (Dionysius Thrax) and 728 (various translations by Step'anos Siwneč'i). The Armenian version of the *Organon* dates to the end of the sixth century. A former disciple of Olympiodorus the Younger, David the Invincible, to whom are ascribed most of the commentaries, may well have been an Armenian Christian and have taken part in the Armenian translation of his own writings. As to Ananias Širakac'i, whose *Autobiography* had been studied by Lemerle, Constantin Zuckerman (2002) convincingly fixed the chronology: 632-640, Ananias learns mathematics and liberal arts in Trebizond at the school of Tychikos. Meanwhile Tychikos also welcomes Greek students sent by the patriarch of Constantinople.

Several years after 667 (death of the Armenian patriarch Anastasius), Ananias compiles his *K̄nnikon* (a textbook concerning the Quadrivium and derived arts).

Athanasiос MARKOPOULOS, *L'éducation à Byzance aux IX^e-X^e siècles : problèmes et questions diverses*

p. 53

The current paper re-examines four key issues relating to the educational process in Byzantium during the ninth-tenth century: i) The presence of schools of *enkykljos paideia* in Constantinople, such as the school of the Nea Ekklesia, the school of the Anonymous Professor and the school where Athanasios of Athos studied, though this begs all manner of questions; ii) The revival of the institution of the *magister liberalium litterarum*, an ancient institution with a long tradition both in late antiquity and the early Byzantine period. An examination of the sources indicates that the institution in question reappeared during the ninth century; as two highly representative examples make clear (Leo the Mathematician and Niketas David), however, this was entirely at the behest of the emperor; iii) The existence of a “school” at which the future patriarch Photios taught an especially exclusive student body; and iv) The return to prominence of “higher education,” which is borne witness to once again in the latter half of the ninth century with the founding of the Magnaura school by *caesar* Bardas, and during the tenth century with the so-called school of Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos.

Jean-Marie MARTIN, *L'Italie byzantine au XI^e siècle*

p. 733

11th-century Byzantine Italy covered two distinct administrative units: the *katepanaton* of Italy (former *thema* of Langobardia) and the *thema* of Calabria. To these one should add the short-lived *thema* of Lucania created during the 1040s. These two provinces harboured societies with distinctly marked differences: while Calabria was hellenophone and had never left the Empire's bosom, Longobardia had a Latin-speaking, Lombard population of Germanic ascent. In Longobardia, while Lombard law was applied, a normal local administration was established, mainly staffed by members of the local elite, sometimes distinguished with honorary titles, but usually without extensive landed patrimonies. In order to strengthen the frontiers, the imperial authorities built new towns in Basilicata during the 10th century, and in Capitanata during the 11th century. The two provinces of Longobardia and Calabria also made use of different coinages, the regular imperial coins circulating in the former, while the latter preferred Sicily's gold tari.

Cécile MORRISON, *Revisiter le XI^e siècle quarante ans après : expansion et crise*

p. 611

This chapter provides firstly an assessment of the various approaches of the eleventh-century economy over the forty years elapsed since Lemerle summoned the international Table Ronde in Paris (20-23.09.1973). The gloomy picture of increasing political, social and economic disintegration then prevailing has been since deeply overhauled. In the 1970's a first phase of research reconsidered more favourably the 1000's-1060's and the 1100's-1160's on either side of the 1070's-1080's undebatable

crisis and accepted the “expansion” perspective introduced by Hendy and Lemerle, although Harvey’s 1989 book of this title did not reckon the importance of the investment by peasants and powerful in the improvement of rural management, as highlighted by Lefort *et al.* The 1990’s–2010’s historiography saw the integration of the enlarged archaeological documentation into the *Economic history of Byzantium* ed. by A. E. Laiou and numerous new studies of rural settlement and trade. The second part focuses on Byzantine money in the eleventh-century and recalls the factual data concerning its metal content and the estimates of the number of coins struck before revisiting the interpretation of the successive phases of gold debasement and offering a partial update of my 1973 (*TM* 6, 1976) too blunt explanation of the process involved in the earlier expanding phase.

Paolo ODORICO, *Du premier humanisme à l’encyclopedisme : une construction à revoir* p. 23

Since its appearance in 1971, Paul Lemerle’s study *Le premier humanisme byzantin* deeply influenced scholarship in the field of Byzantine studies. However, in spite of many qualities, this influential book has several significant flaws, such as the invention of a Byzantine “encyclopaedism”: according to Lemerle, during the reign of Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos and instigated by the emperor, a group of scholars devoted itself to the creation of encyclopedias, huge repertoires of knowledge with imperial/moral purpose. The aim of the present paper is to place Lemerle’s ideas in their context, to clearly trace a distinction between “compilation” and “syllogé,” and to pay attention to the structure, the function, and the mentality behind the creation of the texts under scrutiny (the *Excerpta*, for example). The conclusion is beyond doubt: a Byzantine encyclopaedism never existed, and a re-evaluation of the “com-positions” unjustly relegated under the label “compilations” is in order.

Mihailo St. POPOVIĆ, *Les Balkans : routes, foires et pastoralisme au XI^e siècle* p. 665

The present article focuses on the economic history of Byzantium as one of the manifold research interests of the renowned French scholar Paul Lemerle. By summarising and reviewing publications by Nicolas Svoronos, Michael Hendy, Michael Angold, Angeliki Laiou, Jacques Lefort, Gilbert Dagron, Cécile Morrisson and Jean-Claude Cheynet the macro-structures and the development of the economy of the Byzantine Empire are addressed and reviewed through the looking glass of their respective interpretations concerning the economic decline of Byzantium in the late Byzantine period.

The second part of the article deals with the fairs in the Balkan peninsula based on the author’s scholarly work on the volume *Tabula Imperii Byzantini* 16 (“Macedonia, Northern Part”) at the Austrian Academy of Sciences, which represented vivid nodal points of economic activity and local as well as regional transformation. After providing the designation of fairs in the Greek and Slavonic languages (*panēgyris, phoros* and *panagjurū, panagiri, sūborū, forū*), an overview is given on the fairs in the historical region of Macedonia. Finally, another aspect of the Byzantine economic activity in the Balkan peninsula is highlighted by collecting and interpreting evidence on pasture economy in the historical region of Macedonia from the 10th until the 16th centuries. Summer and winter pastures as well as seasonal dwellings of the nomads (i.e. Vlachs) are localised and the respective distribution patterns analysed. This approach leads directly to applications deriving from Digital Humanities (especially HGIS and GIScience), which provide the necessary means for the visualisation and more detailed study of this economic phenomenon.

Vivien PRIGENT, À l’Ouest rien de nouveau ? *L’Italie du Sud et le premier humanisme byzantin*

p. 129

This article aims to ascertain the possibility that Southern Italy played a role in the so-called Macedonian Renaissance studied by Paul Lemerle in *Le premier humanisme byzantin*. The famous Byzantinist discarded the possibility from the outset but our knowledge of the complex realities of Byzantine Italy has considerably improved since 1971, justifying a reappraisal. The position of the Greek language itself in Italy during the “Dark Ages” is first assessed, focusing on the real impact of the 7th-century migrations. Then, a tentative panorama of the available book resources in 7th–9th-

century Southern Italy is offered. Finally, the author investigates how this cultural patrimony could have impacted the Eastern Renaissance insisting on the Muslim invasions of Sicily and the end of Iconoclasm which resulted in an influx of learned Italians in Constantinople. As a case study, sigillographic evidence are adduced to offer a glimpse on the faction built around Gregorios Asbestas, metropolitan bishop of Syracuse, a key-player in church politics at the onset of the Macedonian Renaissance.

Jonathan SHEPARD, *Man-to-man, dog-eat-dog, cults-in-common: the tangled threads of Alexios' dealings with the Franks* p. 749

Paul Lemerle's characterisation of Alexios Komnenos as "un réactionnaire borné" is consistent with Anna Komnena's portrayal of her father's resourcefulness and flair for duplicity. The demarches of Alexios towards the West in quest of military aid seem to exemplify this, along with his less celebrated bid to install a cooperative Rus prince on the Straits of Kerch. However, his interest was broader and deeper than the Byzantine or Latin sources might lead one to expect. He had close ties with other members of the de Hauteville family besides Bohemond and, in taking liege homage from the latter in 1097, he was exploiting a quite recent development in the West. Alexios' interest in the Holy Land was informed by earlier imperial policies, and by continuing communications between the Byzantine lands (including Cyprus) and monasteries in Palestine and northern Syria. Besides assigning John the Oxite to the patriarchal see of Antioch, Alexios kept up ties with the patriarch of Jerusalem. At the same time, he networked busily in Norman Apulia, while maintaining links with Count Roger of Sicily. It is contended that Alexios envisaged a Christian consensus, with three patriarchates under his wing and cooperation from a fourth, Alexandria, fostered by his amicable ties with the Fatimids; he might gain a concordat through a general church council, attended by the Roman pope or his representatives. Fantasizing as the scheme looks now, it might have spoken to significant clerical and secular elements in the West. Events, however, turned against him and Bohemond had no scruples about exploiting them to full advantage at Antioch.

Kostis SMYRLIS, *The fiscal revolution of Alexios I Komnenos: timing, scope, and motives* p. 593

The article examines the turn towards the use of land and tax grants to remunerate imperial officials instead of salaries under Alexios I. To determine the timing, scope and motives of this reform, the article studies two measures of that emperor, namely the confiscations that took place after the census of 1088/89 and the concession of estates and fiscal rights to imperial relatives. It is argued that the confiscations were extensive, affecting most great ecclesiastical and lay landowners, and that the lands seized were usually ceded to imperial relatives and state servants. The analysis of the concessions to imperial relatives underlines their scale suggesting that they were as much payment for military and civil services as they were a way to secure the political support of the beneficiaries. It is finally suggested that, rather than being the result of pressure by the powerful, the concession of lands and taxes to imperial relatives and state servants was dictated by considerations of financial efficiency.

**Jean-Michel SPIESER, *La « Renaissance macédonienne » :
de son invention à sa mise en cause***

p. 43

The expression « Renaissance macédonienne » was not used in the first academic studies about Byzantine art in the second half of the 19th century. But its use was prepared by some comments about the relation between Byzantine art and the classical Greek art. It seems that Charles Diehl used it for the first time in the first edition of his handbook. This notion got a new momentum through the work of Kurt Weitzmann at the end of the 20['] and in the 30['] of the 20th century. He insists more and more in his later work on the ties, in the 10th century, of the Byzantine art with a "perennial Hellenism." These views on Byzantine art are part of a more general appreciation of the Byzantine Empire as a Greek Empire and of the Byzantines as Greeks, sometime as keeping unconsciously something of the genuine classical Greek mind. This view was supported by many art historians and historians until the second third of the 20th century and is not completely forgotten. Nevertheless, beginning with the

70', art historians and historians like H. Belting, A. Cutler, C. Mango tend towards a new approach of Byzantium, stressing its originality and giving more weight to its internal evolution than to the influence of a supposed Greek spirit.

Jean-Michel SPIESER, *L'art au XI^e siècle : une vue d'ensemble*

p. 675

This paper tries to review recent studies on the 11th century's art. The 11th century is itself a flexible notion. It is possible to consider that it starts at some point within the reign of Basil II and ends at the beginning or at the end of the reign of Alexis Ist. It is an important century for the architecture. Many foundations give evidence for the interest of the emperors and the upper class for monasteries. Some architectural innovations belong to this century: if the cross-in-square church remains the most used plan for church building, two new types come up, the so-called Athonite plan and the Greek-cross domed octagon. The origins of both are disputed. It is a common opinion, that both, but principally the Greek-cross domed octagon, have Armenian models, but, if the question remains open, it can be said that neither is a copy of an Armenian known type. In the field of monumental painting, if more monuments are known and published, no important changes in interpretation are offered for the major lines of the stylistic and iconographic evolution. For Greece and Cappadocia, the two areas where the majority of paintings survives, the social origin of the patrons is an important field of study. New interest arises also on the topic of paintings programs, with more balanced answers than that given by O. Demus, whose work remains nevertheless fundamental. For somptuary arts, we need new syntheses.

Anne TIHON, *Premier humanisme byzantin : le témoignage des manuscrits astronomiques*

p. 325

In this paper, the author examines the astronomical manuscripts containing the works of Ptolemy and Theon of Alexandria, in order to determine the level of the astronomical knowledge during the 9th and 10th centuries. The results are rather disappointing: while Byzantine historians suggest a very high level of scientific achievement, one can hardly find in the manuscripts proofs of a real astronomical practice. The beautiful astronomical manuscripts of the 9th century (for example *Vat. gr. 1594*, *Vat. gr. 190*) do not reveal any hints of a reading of the works of Ptolemy and Theon during the 9th and 10th centuries. One can only guess that Ptolemy's *Handy tables* were used for astrological purposes. The most interesting document comes from Palestine (perhaps from Sinai Monastery): the palimpsest *Vat. syr. 623* which contains a copy of a part of the *Handy tables* of Ptolemy written in uncial script around 800 together with an attempt of Arabic translation of Theon's *Small commentary* and a little Greco-Arabic lexicon giving the names of the winds written by the same hand on a Ptolemy's table. It is certainly one of the most ancient testimony of an Arabic translation of Ptolemy's and Theon's works.

Peter VAN DEUN, *Le commentaire de Métrophane de Smyrne sur la Première Épître de Pierre (chapitre 1, versets 1-23)*

p. 389

This article offers the editio princeps of a Byzantine commentary on a part of the First Epistle of Peter (Chapter 1,1-23); this commentary has been written by Metrophanes, who was bishop of Smyrna in the second half of the 9th century and one of the most important opponents to Patriarch Photius. The text has only been preserved in the recent manuscript Athous, Dionysiou 227.

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Avant-propos	v
Abréviations	ix

AUTOUR DU PREMIER HUMANISME BYZANTIN édité par Bernard Flusin

Notions et institutions

Paul MAGDALINO, Humanisme et mécénat impérial aux ix ^e et x ^e siècles	3
Paolo ODORICO, Du premier humanisme à l'encyclopedisme : une construction à revoir	23
Jean-Michel SPIESER, La « Renaissance macédonienne » : de son invention à sa mise en cause.	43
Athanasiос MARKOPOULOS, L'éducation à Byzance aux ix ^e -x ^e siècles	53

Aux marges de l'Empire

Jean-Pierre MAHÉ, L'âge obscur de la science byzantine et les traductions arméniennes hellénisantes vers 570-730	75
Muriel DEBIÉ, « La science est commune » : sources syriaques et culture grecque en Syrie-Mésopotamie par-delà les siècles obscurs byzantins	87
Vivien PRIGENT, <i>À l'ouest rien de nouveau?</i> L'Italie du Sud et le premier humanisme byzantin	129

Acteurs

Stephanos EFTHYMIADIS, De Taraise à Méthode : l'apport des premières grandes figures reconcidéré	165
Theodora ANTONOPOULOU, Emperor Leo VI the Wise and the “first Byzantine humanism”: on the quest for renovation and cultural synthesis	187
Margherita LOSACCO, Photius, la <i>Bibliothèque</i> , et au-delà : l'état de la recherche, l'usage des classiques et les préfaces du corpus	235
Bernard FLUSIN, Aréthas de Césarée et la transmission du savoir	309

Genres

Anne TIHON, Premier humanisme byzantin : le témoignage des manuscrits astronomiques .	325
Valérie FROMENTIN, La mémoire de l'histoire : la tradition antique, tardo-antique et byzantine des historiens grecs, v ^e siècle avant-x ^e siècle après J.-C.)	339
Reinhart CEULEMANS & Peter VAN DEUN, Réflexions sur la littérature anthologique de Constantin V à Constantin VII	361
Peter VAN DEUN, Le commentaire de Métrophane de Smyrne sur la Première Épître de Pierre (chapitre 1, versets 1-23)	389

ÉTUDES SUR LE XI^E SIÈCLE
 édité par Jean-Claude Cheynet

Historiographie

Dimitris KRALLIS, Historians, politics, and the polis in the eleventh and twelfth centuries .. 419

Histoire sociale

Jean-Claude CHEYNET, La société urbaine 449

James HOWARD-JOHNSTON, Procès aristocratiques de la *Peira* 483

Dominique BARTHÉLEMY, L'aristocratie franque du xi^e siècle en contraste
 avec l'aristocratie byzantine 491

Luisa ANDRIOLLO & Sophie MÉTIVIER, Quel rôle pour les provinces dans la domination
 aristocratique au xi^e siècle? 505

Raúl ESTANGÜI GÓMEZ & Michel KAPLAN, La société rurale au xi^e siècle : une réévaluation. 531

Les institutions

Andreas GKOUTZIOUKOSTAS, Administrative structures of Byzantium during
 the 11th century: officials of the imperial secretariat and administration of justice..... 561

John HALDON, L'armée au xi^e siècle : quelques questions et quelques problèmes 581

Kostis SMYRLIS, The fiscal revolution of Alexios I Komnenos: timing, scope and motives ... 593

La vie économique

Cécile MORRISON, Revisiter le xi^e siècle quarante ans après : expansion et crise 611

David JACOBY, Byzantine maritime trade, 1025–1118..... 627

Johannes KODER, Remarks on trade and economy in eleventh century Asia Minor:
 an approach 649

Mihailo St. POPOVIĆ, Les Balkans : routes, foires et pastoralisme au xi^e siècle 665

Vie culturelle et religieuse

Jean-Michel SPIESER, L'art au xi^e siècle : une vue d'ensemble 675

Béatrice CASEAU & Marie-Christine FAYANT, Le renouveau du culte des stylites syriens
 aux x^e et xi^e siècles? La Vie abrégée de Syméon Stylite le Jeune (BHG 1691c) 701

Byzance et la périphérie

Jean-Marie MARTIN, L'Italie byzantine au xi^e siècle 733

Jonathan SHEPARD, Man-to-man, dog-eat-dog, cults-in-common: the tangled threads of
 Alexios' dealings with the Franks 749

Isabelle AUGÉ, Les Arméniens et l'Empire byzantin (1025–1118) 789

Abstracts/Résumés en anglais 809

Liste des contributeurs 819

Index général 821
 des manuscrits..... 844

Table des matières 847